

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1870.

The Week.

CONTRARY to the anticipations we expressed last week, Louis Napoleon has pushed on to extremities, and war is now on foot between France and Prussia, although, at the present writing, there is no news of actual collision, though the telegraphers report sometimes a slight skirmish, and at others an awful battle, as having occurred on Sunday or Monday last. It is now universally acknowledged that Prussia had, before the declaration of war, conceded everything which self-respect permitted or usage required. The crisis has been brought on by the Emperor's insisting that the King should not only repudiate all connection with the Hohenzollern candidature, or even forbid it, but should make a general disavowal on behalf of himself and his family of all intention of ever at any time laying claim to the Spanish throne. Of course this was an insult. If you accuse a neighbor in private of having given you cause of offence, and he denies having committed or connived at the act of which you complain, and you then insist upon his promising that he never will commit such an act, or connive at it, most people would consider it the part of prudence for you to keep the doors open in the line of your retreat, if your neighbor be a choleric man. The insult appears to have been aggravated by the conduct of the French ambassador, M. Benedetti, who, doubtless under instructions, pursued the King to Ems, dogged him, and insisted peremptorily on an answer. This led, as was of course expected at Paris, to his prompt dismissal by a message, which was doubtless uncivil, through an aide-de-camp, and war was forthwith declared by France.

The whole performance bears a striking resemblance to the manner in which faction fights used to be "inaugurated" in fairs by another branch of the Celtic family. There is one emotion which probably no man but a thoroughbred Celt is in our day capable of experiencing, and that is a sense of wrong at not being attacked by somebody. Accordingly, we find the French looking on themselves as martyrs, and the police are encouraging the singing of the *Marseillaise* in Paris—a shout of defiance hurled at a ruthless invader—though the guilt of the foe appears thus far, in this instance, to consist in not having declared war without provocation. Of course, however, there can be no doubt that war with Prussia has long been deliberately planned by the court. The failure of the Imperial anticipations with regard to the results of the campaign of 1866, and the rather ludicrous rebuff experienced by the Emperor when he politely asked the victor for the Rhenish Provinces, coming on top of the Mexican disaster, gave the Napoleonic dynasty a serious blow, and the last three years have been passed in preparation for some stroke of retrieval. The army has been enlarged, reorganized, and rearmed with breech-loaders. There can be little question, however, that the final move has been precipitated by the result of the plébiscite, and this result has been due partly to the insane behavior of the Reds and partly to the baseness and stupidity of M. Ollivier. The Flourens and Rocheforts managed to frighten thoroughly all that portion of the French people which has anything to lose and loves a quiet life, and some sapient Liberals intensified their alarm by treating these madcaps with the respect due to real champions of freedom. The Emperor cunningly appealed once more to the popular voice while the public mind was in this state—a distinctly revolutionary proceeding to which M. Ollivier tamely submitted rather than resign. Thinking himself enabled by the vote to throw off his pretence of liberalism and go back once more to pure Cæsarism—that is, the reign of brute force veiled by the mock deliberations of a sham legislature—Napoleon has once more thrown himself on the army, and provided a victim for it in the person of Prussia.

The probable limits of the war no man living can determine. The most serious feature in the case is that the original cause of the dispute—the Hohenzollern candidature—being removed, it will be almost impossible for the Emperor to strive for anything short of the Rhine Provinces; the French people will certainly consider anything short of their annexation as a sign of failure, and Louis Napoleon cannot afford to make another military failure. It is doubtful whether he would survive one; the dynasty certainly would not. But it is impossible to conceive of a cession of German soil by Prussia in our day, except as the result of overwhelming defeat—such defeats as only the elder Napoleon was competent to inflict. Any victories the French may achieve are pretty sure to be dearly bought, and to leave the victor little energy or audacity, while they would be sure to weld Germany into a solid and enduring mass. Moreover, as a "rectification" of the French frontier, the Rhine Provinces of Prussia would be of no use without Belgium, and any menace to Belgium would unquestionably bring England into the field. Her obligations on this score are such as cannot be evaded without greater humiliation than the English people are prepared for; and, England in, all other powers would follow, and we should have such a clearing off of old scores as has not been witnessed since 1813. We suspect, before it is all over, the opinion which was generally held out of France in 1815, that Bonapartes are enemies of the human race, will have generally revived. But it is not the Bonapartes, after all, who are most to blame, but the French people, whose want of political sense produces Bonapartes just as our foreign vote in New York produces Tweeds and Sweeneys. Tyrants and demagogues must have a suitable soil to grow on, just like fungi or weeds.

The probabilities are that the campaign will be a slow one, owing to the age of the principal generals on both sides—they are all sixty and more; but it is certain that the engagements will, owing to the weapons employed, be murderous. There is one contingency which may be looked to as capable of closing the war at any moment—the breaking down of the French Emperor's nerves. This suddenly brought about the treaty of Villafranca, in the midst of successful operations, in which he had the sympathy of Europe, and when he was eleven years younger and in better health. Thiers and Jules Favre, approaching the subject from opposite sides, condemn the war as unprovoked; but, although there is little doubt that the enthusiasm for it which has been reported from Paris has been to some extent manufactured, once the troops are in the field there will be only one party in France. In Germany, too, the actual advance of the French will, there is no question, end all wavering, even on the part of those who most hate and fear Prussia. Baden takes the lead, and the rest of the South Germans will go in one by one. Their case is a hard one. If the war strengthens Prussia, she will probably swallow them without more ado; if she is defeated, they have to share in a humiliation which for all Germans has traditional horrors. French rule and French campaigns have left bitter memories all over the confederation.

And now, would it be too much to ask of the daily papers either to employ rational beings as their news collectors in Europe, or else *edit* the despatches before publishing them?—that is, if not weigh their probability, at least strike out those portions which are, through their absurdity, insulting to the intelligent reader. For instance, who that finds amongst his Cable telegrams the announcement that "the French hold Rome, the key of the Mediterranean," does not feel his fingers instinctively searching for the hair or nose of the Associated Press? How does that body suppose a person of average sense likes being told seriously as a piece of news that "Eastern France is absolutely alive with soldiers," or that "the Corps Législatif had declared war against Prussia at fifty minutes past one this afternoon," or "that secret instructions have been issued to French officers that the troops shall divide all lands they conquer?" We think the press owes it to the American public to offer a reward for the discovery of the person who

sent this last report over the wires, if it did come over the wires. A more wanton insult to the American people, including the lunatics and inebriates, it would require a man with a genius for insults to devise.

The telegraphic report from Paris, to the effect that the leaders of the various parties in Hungary have united in a public declaration of sympathy for France, will most likely turn out to be a fabrication of French newsmongers. Of the three parties in that country, the extreme Left, which from time to time receives its inspiration from Kossuth, desires nothing more ardently than the fullest success of Prussia, which would lead to a consolidation of the whole of Germany under the Hohenzollern dynasty, and the total break-up of Austria, and consequently to the complete independence of Hungary. The moderate Liberal party, whose leading organ is Jókai's *Hon*, have also many a time unequivocally declared for the cause of German unity, and against the pretensions and interference of both France and Austria. The Conservative party, generally designated as the Deák party from the name of its leader, might perhaps be induced by its belief that the continued existence of Austria is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the Hungarian nationality not to rejoice in the too complete success of Prussia; but that party is too prudent and too well disciplined to indulge in exaggerated and premature effusions of sentiment. Nor would Deák himself, "the Aristides of Hungary," be inclined to lend his voice to the cause of the aggressor, even when likely to serve the interest of his country. Some insignificant demonstration in favor of France may have taken place in Pesth, on the part of some rash youths, but we are convinced the leaders of the Hungarian parties have had nothing to do with it.

A decorous and business-like close of a session nobody expects, for somehow Congress always contrives to be at the last in a great hurry, and in a state of extreme confusion, so the House was like a bedlam on Friday, when the adjournment took place. But if there was as much noise and disorder as ever, there seems to have been an improvement in particulars more essential. "One-half of the House occupied itself in watching the other half," and there was far less than the regular amount of jobbery. There was, however, no lack of attempts of all kinds, down to the simple and bold device of surreptitiously inserting a clause never enacted into a bill in process of engrossment. It would seem as if there ought to be no difficulty in detecting the author of this little trick, but, so far as we hear, the honorable member, or the clerk, or whoever it was, has not as yet been discovered; nor do we remember any case of the kind in which investigation was followed by the public discovery of the culprit's name. The House was ready for adjournment before the Senate, which body could not be brought to an agreement with the House's views concerning the Georgia Bill and the Indian appropriations.

Just what in effect has been done with Georgia it is not easy to see, beyond the fact that she is once more within the Union. The latest fighting over her has been caused by the question whether or not before her admittance she should be saddled with a Congressional command to keep Bullock and his crew in office for a term of two years longer than otherwise they could have kept in. No mortal knows any good reason why House and Senate should not have driven him from their doors, and it is past guessing what can be the motives of Congressmen in guarding his interests. But, so far as now appears, Congress, in its final action, has at least shirked the settlement of the question, if it has not settled it in a way to make its miserable record in regard to the Georgia muddle consistently unwise and incapable to the very end. The bill declares Georgia in the Union, and ordains that State elections shall be held "in accordance with the State constitution." What it is that the law and the constitution order is the question over which Bullock and his enemies have been disputing, and now, it would seem, Bullock and his judges and Legislature are to have the deciding of it, so that on the whole we are likely to hear a little more of Georgia.

The quarrel over the appropriations for the Indians terminated in a truce, but there is no peace. The House claims the right to make or

to refuse to make appropriations necessary for the carrying out of treaties. The Senate, of course, maintains that the treaty-making power is vested in itself and the President conjointly, and that whenever the payment of money is necessary for the carrying out of a treaty, the House is bound to make the necessary appropriations, asking no questions; otherwise, it would be arrogating to itself the exercise of treaty-making functions, a sphere from which it is shut out by the Constitution. It is proper to observe, by the way, that this troublesome problem in the working of our political machine has come up now and here because of our absurd fashion of calling our bargaining and dickering with a few naked savages an exercise of the "treaty-making power." Still, it was safe to come up sooner or later, and the House, which yielded reluctantly at the time of the Alaska purchase, is said to have made up its mind not to yield in case Mr. Sumner had ever brought forward the St. Thomas treaty. General Grant and Secretary Cox were of course very anxious for the passage of some sort of a bill, as otherwise an Indian war was inevitable, while in case the Secretary could fulfil his engagements, there was a prospect of general peace—Red Cloud himself being "good in his heart" at present, and in person preaching goodness to a pair of hostile tribes disposed for war. Mr. Dawes undertook to get the matter settled by offering to put into the hands of the President five million dollars, to be spent as he in his discretion might think best; but this the Senate would not have; and in the last of a dozen or so of conferences, the House Committee assented to the Senate's bill, but attached to it a declaration that their action must be taken as neither affirming nor denying the validity of the Senate's opinion as to appropriations for treaties, and the question is sure to be reopened.

The Army Bill was another measure that got a great deal of attention in the closing days of the session. It is a measure as to which it is difficult to say whether it was more the result of a spirit of true economy or of that curious wool-pulling economy which covers, scantily, such a multitude of sins of extravagance in Washington. Here is the Senate, which absolutely has passed every land-grabbing bill that it could lay its hands on, and which provoked the derisive laughter of the House by sending in its Secretary, too late, in the very last seconds of the session, with the announcement of still one more grant of lands—this economical body it is that effects a saving of \$1,300 on the salary of Sheridan, and \$500 or so, more or less, on that of Sherman, and then asks our admiration for its carefulness in expenditures! However, the law seems to be in the main judicious. The number of names on the retired list is fixed at three hundred; any officer of thirty years' standing may be retired at his request; a court of enquiry is to examine into the cases of officers held to be incompetent or of bad character, and such as cannot stand an examination are to be mustered out; any officer that likes can be mustered out by asking it, and gets, on going, a year's pay; the normal number of major-generals is set at three and of brigadier-generals at six, and no appointments are to be made until there are less than three officers of the one grade and six of the other; and, finally, the grade of general ceases with Sherman, and of lieutenant-general with Sheridan. One other thing in the new law the country will approve, and that is, that officers are forbidden to wear brevet uniforms while on duty, and are never to be designated by brevet titles in official communications. The country would have been well pleased to see the whole brevet system abolished.

The high-tariff men who have actually killed American ship-building, and have done it as directly and more effectually than if they had burnt every ship-yard and hanged every shipwright, were of course very loud in opposition to President Grant's proposal that Congress should admit foreign ships free of duty, should remit the duties on foreign articles that enter into ship-construction, and should grant American registers to vessels whose European owners might wish to transfer them to our flag. With the help of the other high-tariff men, and with the advantage of the time in the session when the proclamation was sent in, the copper, iron, and cordage men were able to defeat the measure proposed. It might probably have been of less advantage than many expected, but that is a matter which

it is not worth while to consider at present, now that it is not going to be tried, and it is the less worth while now that there are growing indications that the whole Congressional management of our shipping interest, as of the rest of the trade of the country, will in no long time undergo a very thorough overhauling from top to bottom. But it occurs to the reader of the proclamation and the debate upon it to ask why, if the free admission of material for ship-building and of foreign-built ships is likely to be profitable to this country during the fifteen months next to come—why would it have been of detriment during the fifteen months last past? Who would have been hurt in case the President's proclamation had been made law, except those few thousands of our forty millions of people who were clamorous against it on Friday in Washington?

Mr. Motley comes home from London, and Mr. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, a very able and competent man, takes his place. The cause of Mr. Motley's dismissal, for it is said he refused to resign, seems to be a radical difference of opinion between him and the President and State Department as to the mode of settling the *Alabama* question. The President and Mr. Fish, as our readers may remember, hold that the concession of belligerent rights to the rebels by England was simply an abuse of discretion; that the real wrong towards this country lay in subsequent open violations of neutral duty—an opinion which, we believe, is shared by nearly all the jurists of the civilized world who have ever heard of the question. Mr. Sumner, however, maintains that they are all wrong, and has managed, so runs the story, to impress Mr. Motley so profoundly with his view of the matter, that the latter refused to surrender it, even to Secretary Fish, and urged it on Lord Clarendon. This is unfortunate in all sorts of ways, because Mr. Motley, if not as sound a lawyer as might be found for the place, has a variety of other and hardly less valuable qualifications for it which are not easily supplied elsewhere.

Our chances of a quiet life in New York have been seriously diminished during the week by what we fear is the commencement of a series of Orange riots; or, rather, of Ribbon attacks on Orangemen. An Irish "Protestant Association" of this city went last week on a picnic to Elm Park, accompanied by their wives and children, and on the march displayed their Orange banners and badges, and played what are in Ireland known as "party tunes." They were peacefully feasting and dancing in commemoration of the Battle of the Boyne, when some hundreds of Catholic laborers who were in the neighborhood, hearing of it, at once repaired to the scene of gaiety, and, under the influence of a sense of duty, as the Catholic papers seem to think, began to pistol, cudgel, and stone the whole party, women and children included. The Orangemen resisted valiantly, in a style which would have done King William good to see; while the Papist onslaught, if made at Franklin or Trout River, would have sent the redcoats flying in every direction; that is, if the redcoats had been women, with long hair, or had had no arms, and had been taken unawares, Canada would by this time be a Fenian Republic. A second attack on the street-cars, after the Orangemen had dispersed, and were going home, in which women were again brutally beaten, and all sexes robbed with impartiality, closed a disgraceful day—one of the many days which is gradually bringing the civilized world to regard an "Irish patriot" as a sort of cowardly tiger, with the voice of an ass and the heels of a hare. Six persons were killed and over a hundred wounded. Is there nobody of sufficient influence and education among the Fenian leaders or the Catholic clergy to prevent these atrocities?

It is quite true that the Boyne was a victory of one race and one creed over another, and was followed by shocking oppression on the part of the victors; it is natural that Irish Orangemen should like to celebrate it, for it delivered them from what is popularly known as "a very tight place," and changed the course of both Irish and English history. But it is also true that it is bad taste and policy and citizenship to persist in the public celebration of any event which reminds one's neighbor

of misfortune and humiliation, and the persistence of Orangemen in doing it comes very badly from such "Bible Christians" as they profess to be. On the other hand, we wonder whether it ever occurred to a Fenian that no political success, peace, or comfort is possible to any people which has no capacity for forgetting. A man who mourns over "six hundred years of wrong" confesses *ipso facto* that he is a miserable politician as well as a silly fellow; and anybody who is roused to such a degree by the celebration of a battle fought two hundred years ago that he has to throw paving-stones or flourish a knife, may know that he is born to be ruled by a calmer and graver people, that such as he can never found a state or administer a government, or be anything but a laughing-stock and a by-word. If all races found it such a dreadful thing to have the memory of lost battles and other long-past political misfortunes recalled, the civilized world would spend most of its time rioting, and calling names, and hurling defiance, and would soon cease to be civilized.

The Infallibility dogma has at last been carried in the Council, a minority of about 90 holding out against it; but this minority includes nearly all that is respectable for character, talents, learning, and influence in the Catholic Church, and represents by far the larger portion of the Catholic world, the majority being largely made up of Italian bishops, and bishops *in partibus*, who are literally dependent on the Pope for their bread and butter. The formal proclamation of the dogma, however splendid the ceremony may be made, will now excite but little attention, the public mind being fixed on the war. The Jesuit fathers, who have "put the thing through," to use the phrase of their brethren the politicians, begin to find that the vote in the Council by no means ends their troubles. A spirit of revolt has begun to show itself among both clergy and laity all over Germany, and even in Bohemia. The Prussian Catholics are especially rampant, and in the Swiss Catholic canton secession is openly talked of. In England, the effect promises to be not less disastrous. Father Newman has spoken out pretty boldly, and the leading Catholic layman, Lord Acton, has passed the winter at Rome, as one of the chiefs of the opposition. The worst is probably still to come, as the heretics, and schismatics, and scoffers, instigated by Satan, will probably now resort to comparisons of what the actual Pope says with what his predecessors have said, seeking thus to throw ridicule on the new article of faith. As long as Pius IX. lives, however, they will be handsomely cursed for their pains.

Talking of the Church, there has been a curious controversy in Dublin between the National Board of Education and Cardinal Cullen touching the morality taught to children in the school text-books. For instance, the Cardinal denies that it is right to teach children that concealing the truth to avoid unpleasant consequences is lying, or that "we are commanded by God to speak every man truth unto his neighbor." But to the following statement, which is made to the children in school, he specially objects: "We may say things which are not entirely false, but may bear a double meaning, or are true in themselves, but not true in the sense in which our hearers understand us, in which case we lead people to believe what is false. This is called equivocation, and is to all intents and purposes the same as a lie, and equally criminal." "This teaching is," he says, "not correct, and such doctrines ought not to be infused into the minds of children."

We have the best authority for contradicting the statement that Father Hyacinthe had obtained from Rome a regular dispensation from his monastic engagements, and had been registered among the secular clergy. In the prevailing tone of opinion at Rome, his secularization would not be accorded without a retraction on his part of his famous protest of 20th September, 1869. But, so far from withdrawing that, Father Hyacinthe abides by the convictions that compelled it, and even renews it the more energetically in face of the new excesses of the Ultramontane party, now so rampant at Rome.

WITH WHICH SIDE SHOULD WE SYMPATHIZE?

THERE could hardly be a more striking illustration of the shallowness of our civilization than the fact that one of the foremost nations in the world should at this moment be placing its blood and treasure at the disposal of a Bonaparte—of all men in the world—to carry on a war of succession. The reappearance of a Bonaparte on the throne of France was an express assertion and vindication on his part and on that of the nation of two doctrines—of which the attack which they are now making on Prussia is an open repudiation—viz., that every nation has a right to choose anybody it pleases for sovereign, and that no choice it can make gives any other good reason for either fear or complaint. The will of the people being the supreme law, the blood or antecedents of the person it chooses for its chief could not, we were told, affect its foreign policy. It was only Bourbons and other imbecile adherents of divine right, and of the theory of royal ownership of kingdoms, who would see in family alliances any necessary disturbance of international relations. The other powers of Europe frankly accepted this preaching in 1851. They remained perfectly tranquil while the head of a family which had been proscribed by the public law of Europe as dangerous to its peace put himself on the throne of France by a bloody revolution, and admitted that if France was satisfied nobody else had any right to complain. It is this man who is now plunging into an armed conflict, first of all, in denial of the right of the Spanish people to choose their king; and, secondly, in assertion of the old monarchical theory that the foreign policy of governments is regulated by the blood-relationships of its sovereigns; in short, we are witnessing in the nineteenth century a war of succession, in which the principal actor is an elected dictator.

The *World* last week endeavored, with a good deal of ingenuity, to show that so far as any claim to the sympathy of the American people is concerned, Prussia is on no better footing than France, owing to the despotic temper and thoroughly feudal antecedents of the reigning king. But it must not be forgotten that he has inherited both his temper and his position, and that he is a very old man, to whose vagaries the Prussian people submit, partly because they entertain a traditional affection for his house, and partly because his reign must at best be short. In fact, he is but a relic of the old régime—the last surviving monarch who believes in the divine origin of his own authority. His heir is a liberal, and, if not a "progressive man" in our sense of the word, is sufficiently so for all the purposes of Prussian progress, which, if not rapid, is one of the surest and strongest things the modern world has to show. Nothing else certainly has offered Europe thus far so comfortable an escape from feudalism; nothing else has been so successful in popularizing the government, while upholding the claims of knowledge and skill to the supreme control of human affairs, and in stimulating industry without creating a vast proletariat. The arrogance of the Prussians there is no denying, and the foreign policy of Bismarck has certainly been thoroughly unscrupulous; but then his unscrupulousness has been displayed in the execution of schemes to which every lover of his kind must wish success; in the deliverance of a great people from being the prey of despicable and voracious princelings; and in the infusion of activity, largeness of aim, and noble ambition into their national life. Frederick William and his minister will pass away. The work of their hands will last, and the Prussia they have aggrandized must certainly long remain that community of the old world to which those who are interested in the improvement of human character through political action will look with most hope. There is no enemy of standing armies, too—nobody who feels the magnitude of the evils which these vast isolated hordes of idle men inflict on the world—but must wish that when an army composed as the Prussian army largely is, takes the field in a good cause, victory may perch on its banners. An army in whose ranks ploughmen fresh from the field, clerks fresh from their desks, and professors fresh from their chairs, stand shoulder to shoulder, must always be an object of sympathy to those, of whatever country, who look forward to the time when the soldier will never be anything else than an armed man defending his home, and must, wherever its "völlied thunders" fly, make the spread of Caesarism impossible.

That the present Government of France is a Caesarist government—that is, a government of brute force, unhallowed by time and unsupported by traditions or sentiment—and that it can never be anything else, we suppose is now fully demonstrated. Nothing can be clearer than that the late concessions to liberalism were only a sham and a snare, intended to extract from France the vote which has encouraged the desperate gambler who occupies the throne to engage in another and unprovoked war, in the hope of securing his son the succession. There is no longer a vestige of constitutionalism in his policy or his methods. Unfortunately, he has this time hit upon the very surest means of rallying the French people to his standard. They would not be the descendants of the Gauls if any regard for political freedom caused them to hesitate seriously about following to the field anybody to whom either law or accident or usurpation had committed the national flag. Nevertheless, in spite of their antecedents, we are still loth to believe in the accuracy of the telegraphic stories of the enthusiasm with which this wicked war has been greeted. We may be sure that, however the ministerial press in Paris may shriek for battle, the cause of national progress, of political freedom, and of humanity has not been left without plenty of eloquent witnesses in France as well as elsewhere, and if they do their duty manfully, and the Prussians hold German soil stoutly, it may be that this will be the last time we shall see the French army doing the bloody work of reckless and unscrupulous adventurers. Nobody who knows anything of its many great qualities, of the courage, the science, the self-devotion which it always has to show, or of the almost pathetic worship of the point of honor of which even the rank and file are capable, can see it wasted in these wild forays without the deepest sympathy and regret.

THE NEXT CONGRESS.

THE political complexion of the next Congress is a matter of considerable speculative interest, in respect to which, even at this early day, it is possible to form some reasonable anticipations.

The political aspect of the Senate cannot be materially changed. The Republicans may, and we think will, lose one Senator from each of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Jersey, and North Carolina. They have in effect lost one each in Oregon and Tennessee. They may lose one in West Virginia; but they are more likely to gain one in Minnesota, and may possibly, through the colored vote, gain one in Delaware. There is a bare possibility of loss in Illinois and Nebraska; but this can only happen in case of a political deluge. In any event, the Senate would remain Republican by more than a two-thirds vote.

The House of Representatives is a body more open to change; and here the Democrats confidently look for success. This is, however, no new story, and proves nothing. We must consider the details of the approaching contest, with small regard for the vague expectations of excited politicians on either side. In order to arrive at a fair conclusion, we must consider the country in separate divisions, with reference to the peculiar wants and interests of each section. There is no general wave of feeling which is likely to sway the country as a whole. Indifference is the only feeling which is widespread at this time. In the New England States, we discern no indications of political discontent, and see no reason for expecting great changes. The doubtful district of New Hampshire is made reasonably safe by the fact that the Navy Yard is in it, and is controlled by Republicans, who doubtless understand, from the fate of Collector Grinnell, that they are expected to be vigilant politicians. The Republicans must, however, lose two districts in Connecticut, which they carried only by reason of the unpopularity of the last Democratic nominees, who were formerly Johnson Republicans. In New York, the war between the Fenton and Morgan factions seriously weakens the Republican party; and there are also other troubles in its ranks which have a very unfavorable influence. Governor Hoffman has pursued a line of policy which has strengthened him with his party in the rural districts, and has, upon the whole, strengthened his party as well as himself. The result will certainly be a loss to the Republicans of the 11th, 12th, and 30th districts, while they will run some risk of losing the 16th (Clinton), 18th (Saratoga), 21st (Oneida), and 28th (Monroe) districts. We do not believe, how-

ever, that they can lose all of these, though we incline to expect a loss of the 18th and 21st. Several other districts were lost at the recent judicial election, but that afforded no test by which the result of an election next fall could be measured. In New Jersey, Mr. Hill, who was elected by 79 majority, can hardly expect to succeed again. But, on the other hand, Mr. Haight, the Democratic member from the 2d district, may be defeated by the colored voters, who are very numerous in his district. In Pennsylvania, we judge that the present ill-feeling in the 3d district will cause the loss of Mr. Myers's seat. The 10th (Coke's) district is naturally Democratic, and will no doubt go that way this time. So will the 21st (Covode's). The 13th (Mercur's) is likely to be lost. The Republican majority has been diminishing there for some time, having been 1,287 in 1866, and only 311 in 1868; and the colored vote will be small. But the colored vote will, we think, gain the 5th district to the Republicans, and save the 16th, which would otherwise be doubtful. In the 17th, Mr. Morrell is running again, which means that he intends to be re-elected; and, in Pennsylvania, "where there's a will, there's a way." We consider Delaware and one district in Maryland doubtful, since the admission of colored voters; but shall, in our final estimate, leave them, as at present, Democratic.

In the Southern States generally, the financial mismanagement of many Republican officials will prejudice the party. But it has been made quite clear that nothing except intimidation will divert the colored vote from the Republican ticket. We do not therefore believe that any Republican who was fairly elected in 1868 from the South will be succeeded by a Democrat now, except in cases where the majority was very small. Mr. Heflin, of Alabama, was elected by 153 majority. Messrs. Roots, of Arkansas, and Van Horn and Dyer, of Missouri, were, we fear, counted in rather than elected. The operation will hardly be repeated. In Tennessee, the Democrats will doubtless gain five or six members, owing to the repeal of disfranchising laws. We allow them six. On the other hand, the colored vote will gain the St. Louis district, with at least two Kentucky districts, and save Duval's in West Virginia, which would otherwise be unsafe.

In the West, the free-trade sentiment is not unlikely to be the cause of some division among the Republicans; but the course of the Western Congressmen has been generally shaped according to the interests of their respective districts, and is probably satisfactory to their constituents. The districts which were closest in 1868 are precisely those in which the colored vote will now be largest, except in the northern part of Ohio. By this vote we think that the Republicans will save, in Ohio, Stevenson's district (majority, 497), Schenck's (475) (he talks of declining renomination, but doubtless will not decline), Lawrence's (629), Smith's (343), and Moore's (956). But the colored people alone can hardly save Welker (462) or Bingham (416), and we doubt if they will suffice to save Winans (155) in the Columbus district, although colored people are numerous there. Mr. Winans is a free-trader, and there is much opposition to his nomination on that account. If he is thrown aside on that ground, the district will be lost. In Indiana, the colored vote would save all the Republican members, but for some domestic quarrels, which bid fair to lose two members. This vote will, we believe, save the Detroit district in Michigan, and may save the doubtful district in Illinois, though we should concede that to the Democrats. The Milwaukee district in Wisconsin will, we think, be lost by the Republicans this year.

We know of no reason for expecting any changes in California, Nevada, or Nebraska. But we put Nevada in the Democratic column, inasmuch as the Republican majority there has diminished since 1864.

The prospect for the next House, under these circumstances, appears to be about as follows:

	Rep.	Dem.		Rep.	Dem.
Alabama	3	3	Indiana	6	5
Arkansas	1	2	Iowa	6	0
California	1	2	Kansas	1	0
Connecticut	1	3	Kentucky	2	7
Delaware	0	1	Louisiana	3	2
Florida	1	0	Maine	5	0
Georgia	3	3	Maryland	0	5
Illinois	9	5	Massachusetts . .	10	0

	Rep.	Dem.		Rep.	Dem.
Michigan	6	0	Pennsylvania . .	14	10
Minnesota	2	0	Rhode Island . .	2	0
Mississippi	4	1	South Carolina .	4	0
Missouri	6	3	Tennessee	2	6
Nebraska	1	0	Texas	2	2
Nevada	0	1	Vermont	3	0
New Hampshire . .	3	0	Virginia	3	5
New Jersey	1	4	West Virginia . .	3	0
New York	15	16	Wisconsin	4	2
North Carolina . .	5	2			
Ohio	11	8	Total	143	99
Oregon	0	1			

THE CURRENCY BILL AGAIN.

Most of our readers will remember the compound-interest notes, bearing six per cent. compound interest, of which several hundred millions were outstanding at the close of the war. These notes were legal tender for their face value, and the national banks held a large amount of them as a part of the "legal-tender reserves," which they are obliged by law to keep on hand for the payment of their depositors and the prompt redemption of their own notes. Of course, they were extremely valuable to the banks for this purpose, for the reason that by means of them the people were actually paying the banks interest on the money lying idle in their vaults, which they would have had to keep on hand under any circumstances, for their own protection, whether or not compelled by law.

Now, every United States Secretary of the Treasury has to have a hobby. Mr. Boutwell's hobby is to reduce the rate of interest on the debt—a praiseworthy hobby in itself, though rather mischievous when ridden blindly against the stone walls of fact. So Mr. McCulloch's hobby was to complete at any sacrifice the funding of the debt before the end of his official career. To do this it was necessary to induce the national banks to give up their six per cent. compound-interest notes without the unpleasant use of compulsion. These imperious national paupers insisted upon compensation, and as it seemed impossible to withdraw the national paper from them entirely, a compromise was effected. A new security was created for the benefit of the banks to take the place of the compound-interest notes, but instead of six per cent. compound interest the new securities bore only three per cent. interest, and instead of the banks being allowed to hold their entire reserve in them they were only allowed to hold three-fifths of their reserve in these new securities, which have since become known as the Three Per Cent. Certificates. By the Act of March 2, 1867, fifty millions of these certificates were authorized, and by a subsequent act permission was given to issue twenty-five millions more. But the full amount has never been issued, and by occasional cancellations the total amount outstanding has been reduced to about forty-five millions. It is these forty-five millions of three per cent. certificates that the so-called Currency Bill proposes to abolish.

To this extent the bill is a wise one. The existence of these forty-five millions of certificates is a constant and most serious, though perhaps remote, danger to the Treasury. They are virtually a call loan to the Government for an amount exceeding three or fourfold the entire cash balance of the Treasury on more than one occasion. If presented for payment under the pressure of unforeseen necessities, they might force the Secretary into an unwelcome issue of new greenbacks, involving a total reversal of the established financial policy of the Government. That the danger has not developed into disaster is due solely to favorable events, not to the perverseness of Mr. Boutwell, who is blind to everything except his own political fortunes as they may be advanced by his intended grand achievement—the reduction of the interest rate. This danger the bill is intended to remove. Beyond this commendable intention, there is nothing in it that is not inconsistent, futile, or downright mischievous.

This wonderful emanation of the joint wisdom of House and Senate orders the Secretary to redeem forty-five millions of three per cent. certificates. Of course, it tells him where he is to get the money from. Not a bit of it. According to his last balance-sheet he had on hand about twenty-nine millions of currency. His lowest possible working-balance is about nine millions, so that at best he would have twenty millions to spare for the redemption of certificates.

Owing to imperfect statements, it is not known how large a proportion of these twenty millions consists of national bank-notes, which are not available for the purpose; but we may safely assume that it is not less than one-fourth, leaving, say, fifteen millions of greenbacks to redeem forty-five millions of certificates—very fair arithmetic for Congress.

It may be asked, does the bill require the Secretary to redeem all the certificates at once and immediately? It does not. He is to redeem them as rapidly as certain new national bank-notes, provided for in the bill, shall be issued by new national banks. These may not be issued for a long time, but the very argument upon which the bill passed was, that the need of these new national banks was so urgent as not to admit of a moment's delay. According to the framers of the bill, these new notes will be issued with the utmost rapidity, and hence the Treasury will be called upon to redeem the certificates almost immediately, for which contingency the measure, as we have already shown, makes such admirable provision. Such legislation is humiliating to us as a people, and would ruin our credit abroad if the latter were to any extent based upon the wisdom of our legislators.

For our own part, we do not share the belief that many new national banks will be started, and hence are not alarmed about any danger arising to the Treasury from this source. The difficulty in connection with the three per cent. certificates, which may arise from outside events, and which we shall consider hereafter, has no direct reference to the Currency Bill. The essential question for the mass of the people is, Does the bill affect the amount of circulating medium, the currency of the people? and, if so, in what manner? It is in relation to this important question that so much misrepresentation has been practised. The true answer is: Nominally the Currency Bill increases the currency; practically it diminishes it: apparently it works inflation; in reality it is most decided contraction.

The first section of the bill provides that the Secretary may authorize the issue of fifty-four millions of additional bank-notes, and the next section provides that he shall cancel forty-three millions of certificates, which for all banking purposes are the same as greenbacks. Apparently, therefore, eleven millions more currency is to be issued than withdrawn. In reality, the effect is very different. The moment the Treasury withdraws a dollar of certificates, the bank holding the same is by law obliged to procure a one-dollar greenback to put in its place. Now nothing is so difficult to procure when wanted as greenbacks. Of the four hundred millions (in round numbers) of paper money issued by the Government, all the banks in the United States, according to their last quarterly statement, held precisely eighty-three millions. The balance, as we have repeatedly explained in these columns, is held by the people, who prefer them to national bank-notes and do not want to part with them. So decided is the preference given to greenbacks over national bank-notes, that, even when money is comparatively scarce, national bank-notes are sometimes superabundant, and can be passed among bankers in large lots only at a discount. The further issue of fifty-four millions of national bank-notes, already superabundant, will not add one dollar to the greenbacks, which are now in rather deficient supply. But the destruction of forty-three millions of three per cent. certificates imperatively necessitates the procuring of forty-three millions of additional greenbacks by the banks to take their place. Where are the banks to get them? There is but one answer. They must get them from one another—which is impossible—or they must do without them. In other words: The greenbacks are only needed by the banks for legal reserve against their deposits and their circulation. If they cannot get the additional greenbacks, they must diminish either their deposits or their own circulation. For every one-dollar greenback that they fail to get, they must, according to law, diminish their deposits or circulation *four* dollars. If, therefore, the banks cannot, by some process as yet undiscovered, induce the holders of forty-three millions of greenbacks to give them up in exchange for the same amount of national bank-notes, then the banks must reduce their present circulation or deposits by *four times* forty-three millions. To reduce their circulation thus would be to withdraw one hundred and seventy-two millions of old national bank currency in exchange for fifty-four millions of new. To reduce their deposits would require a curtailment of their loans to a similar extent.

We have purposely given the extreme case. Such a contraction as here described is utterly impossible; it would throw the whole business of the country into confusion. Indeed, the effect of the Currency Bill would not practically be as severe as we have described. In the first place, a certain amount of greenbacks is still always obtainable at a merely nominal premium; and, in the second place, the banks, at last accounts, held more than the reserve required by law, and thus they could lose a small portion of their greenbacks without serious inconvenience. So that, practically, the enforcement of the Currency Bill, even if it is at all likely to be enforced, would not have as serious an effect as we have described. But that any other view than ours, that it works contraction and not inflation, can be for one moment seriously entertained by any thoughtful banker, seems to us totally impossible.

We do not propose at this time to discuss the wisdom or unwisdom of the intended change. There are other features of the bill which claim our attention. The bill itself had its origin in, and is intended to remedy, the supposed injustice of the existing distribution of the national bank circulation among the different States. Whatever injustice and favoritism may have been at work in the original granting of bank charters, was of course injustice against the many in favor of the few. It was the individuals who benefited by the charters, not the people of the different States in which the banks are located. If a merchant in Texas has good security on which to borrow bank-notes, he can borrow them as cheaply from a national bank in Massachusetts as from a national bank in his own State. The great mass of the people in Texas will not find borrowing one bit easier by having new national banks started there. The only effect of redistributing the currency will be that, whereas heretofore certain individuals in the New England States have had the legal right to derive profits from their neighbors, that legal right will hereafter be shared by certain individuals in Texas and elsewhere. The supposed increased borrowing facilities for the Texas merchant is simply a delusion, which does not need to be explained again to readers of the *Nation*, and the Congressional measure to this effect will be about as effectual as Congressional measures often are.

Besides cancelling the three per cent. certificates, authorizing the issue of fifty-four millions of new, and redistributing the old currency, together with various minor objects, the bill also incidentally furnishes the means of returning at an early day to specie payments—means so ingeniously devised that, if we had specie payments to-morrow, this measure alone would be almost sufficient to cause an immediate suspension for five years at least. It is positively astounding in its recklessness. It authorizes the issue of an unlimited amount of coin-notes, on the deposit of United States bonds, and stipulates that, against every one hundred dollars of par value in currency of bonds deposited, eighty dollars of gold notes may be issued, *which the United States guarantees*. At the present moment, when our bonds are really worth nearly par in gold, this does not seem an extravagant risk. But there is no earthly need of the United States incurring any risk whatever in the matter; and, to recognize that the risk incurred is really a most grave one, we need only reflect that, less than nine months ago, our six per cent. bonds were worth less than seventy cents in gold. Where would the Treasury have been then, if this precious law had been in operation? Every dollar of these coin-notes would have been instantly presented for redemption, and banks and Treasury would have been involved in like wreck and ruin. It is very easy to say that such scenes as those of last September are not likely to be re-enacted soon; we do not ourselves believe that they will be; but the Fisks and Goulds are not all dead yet; there are plenty of sensible people who believe that gold will naturally rise again to very high figures; every year since the peace we have had periods of high gold, and on the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian war it ran up to 168. With such recent experience before us, it seems the wildest trifling for the United States Government to offer, without the slightest particle of consideration, an unlimited guarantee that gold shall never again advance beyond 130. Yet this is precisely what section three of the Currency Bill accomplishes. And there was not the slightest necessity for it. For nothing would have been easier than to require of the issuing banks a deposit of bonds sufficient, at their market value *in gold*, amply to secure the

Treasury. The worst of all is that these inadequately secured coin-notes are actually made a legal tender among all specie-paying banks, which is of itself enough to discourage any conservative institution from ever attempting to resume. Yet this bungling specimen of Congressional folly is everywhere hailed as a step towards specie resumption, and, unfortunately, banks are already preparing to organize on the Pacific coast in accordance with its provisions. It is to be hoped that, before serious evil can result, another session of Congress will modify this ill-digested and ill-considered measure, and thereby prevent more financial complications than any we have yet encountered.

THE RACE QUESTION.

THERE can be no question that a most difficult problem for the coming legislators of this country arises from the mingling of the diverse races under its government. Teuton, Celt, Mongol, and negro are already claiming place upon our soil and recognition in our social system. Types of existence belonging to each of the great continents of the Old World are struggling with the modes of thought and action peculiar to our own, and, if we do not add something from South America or Australia to our political caldron, it will be because the aboriginal types of those countries die out before we can get hold of them. It is the fashion to talk of our political system as if it were a new and totally original experiment. Self-government, much in the American form, is an old dream, and to a great extent an old reality; but those who think that we would be nothing unless peculiar can find a sufficiently original feature in what bids fair to be the polygenous character of our people in the future. Not excepting even India, that great eddy where the drift of humanity has been gathering ever since the Asiatic peoples began to move, has any country ever had as diverse materials gathered upon its soil as we now promise to have.

If any one questions the difficulty of this task of fusing diverse races into a harmonious political whole, let him look for a successful political experiment under similar conditions. We are much mistaken if he finds a case where a vigorous political or social life has ever been developed in a state composed of such heterogeneous materials. We are far from asserting that it is impossible to combine several races in one society, and have that society strong. We would only have our people recognize this problem as a difficulty requiring study to understand it, and great political skill to avoid its worst consequences. The strength of the governmental as of all other machines is the strength of the weakest part; it may have one class of its people in advance of the age, yet, if another is far behind in the scale of progress, it is impossible to have a nation of the ideal excellence. Now, in the case of a mixed people, the elements being too heterogeneous for ready fusion, the immediate result of the interaction of the several races is to form a caste system, certain portions of the social duties being delegated to each. There can be no doubt of the great danger to our whole political and social experiment should such a social stratification be the result of the mingling of the several races which are coming together upon our soil. There might be a great people built on such a plan, but few would care to risk the future on the result of such an experiment. We have only to look at the results of the Irish immigration to this country to see how readily a certain spirit of caste is developed. It is now well-nigh impossible to find a day-laborer born upon the soil; his dignity would be compromised by such occupation. Unskilled labor in the older parts of this country is entirely given up to foreigners. Fortunately, this people is of the same race as ourselves, and one or two generations in their new conditions obliterate the distinction. But with a permanent color and a permanent social character, such as the Chinese have, there can be no doubt that there would be more danger from this source.

It is not often that the other branches of thought cast much light upon the problems of social science, but natural history throws some upon this question of race. It is obviously of the first importance to determine how far these peculiarities of the different races are permanent, and what time and means are necessary to modify them in case they are not unalterable.

Applying to man the rules which we know to hold with other ani-

mals, we may get some information on this difficult point. The fundamental fact brought out by the researches of Mr. Darwin is that any characters which have been the property of a group of animals for a long time tend to perpetuate themselves. This tendency to revert to the ancestral type, which is the agent operating to prevent indefinite variations, is probably intense in proportion to the length of time to which the race has been subjected to the conditions which have produced and maintained its character. If this view be correct, and most observers of this class of facts can find something in their own experience to confirm it, we may expect to find those races of men who have been long exposed to the same conditions of existence more difficult to change than others which have been exposed to uniform conditions for only a short time. No one can look at the character of the several races which have distinct traits and a long history without the conviction that there probably is some value to be attached to this view. The most migratory of the races, the Aryan, is the most flexible, accommodating itself to the greatest variety of conditions, and varying most rapidly under the influence of its surroundings. One of the most stationary, the African, reared in a region of singularly uniform conditions for at least four thousand, possibly for five times that number of years, is the most rigid of the types of men, suffering greatly from changes of climate, showing but little tendency to seek new conditions, and less capacity for being modified by them.

Two and a half centuries of existence on this continent have produced very considerable changes in the Aryan race, as represented by our people. The same period, under far more pronounced differences of condition, have produced but little, if any, change in the physical status of the African. It is questionable whether, excepting where there is an admixture of white blood, the color or form have undergone any change. Unfortunately, we are in want of statistics concerning the relative physical condition of the American negro and the African negro, but it is evident that, at the rate of change of the last two centuries, it will require a much longer time than it is worth while for us to talk about to bring him into the condition of our own race.

The Chinaman comes of a stock having as much atavistic force—if we may thus modify the word atavism, which Mr. Darwin uses to designate the tendency of a stock to hold to its ancestral type—as any other type of man except the negro. An old and indigenous people, they may be reckoned upon to remain essentially true to their type for any number of generations.

The world's experience with half-breeds is not such as should incline us to the experiment of a fusion of the three races of our future—if, indeed, the Mongols are going to come in such numbers as to form a large element of our population. With them, if they do come, and with the negro we must reckon upon dealing as heterogeneous materials, taking them for what they are, and trying to make them all they can be. In our effort to do the best possible for ourselves and for them, we should remember that, from the bottom to the top of the animal kingdom, allied races are almost invariably enemies; they dislike each other's very smell, and find in that an excuse for war; and it is probably this animal instinct which makes it so difficult to mingle races without having castes. Furthermore, we should remember that the two races are both well anchored to their peculiarities by the hereditary force—are among the most inflexible materials which could have been given to us. To keep out social stratification, and the attendant loss of power from a political system composed of these elements, may fairly be looked upon as a difficult though, in the darkness of inexperience, no one can say an impossible task. There is manifestly but one road to avoid the danger, and that is to educate, in the broadest sense of that word, each and all to the highest possible point, and to associate as intimately as possible each of these races in all the avocations for which their capacities may fit them.

THE SECULARIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

WE spoke some weeks ago of the decline of the Church as an instrument of social reform. The comments that article has elicited make it worth while coming back to the subject.

A glance at the past discloses three distinct periods in Christian

history. To the first belongs the primitive church—a body with purely spiritual objects, and wholly supported by spiritual power. Subsequently (in the Church of Rome), we see the Christian institution still true to its high moral and religious purposes, but sustained, and practically corrupted, by temporal power. The third era opens with the Reformation, when the Protestant church essayed the difficult task of avoiding mediæval debasement, while it yet reposed on the arm of the state. That the Reformers, like the Catholics, relied on the civil power is attested by English, Scotch, Swiss, Dutch, and Swedish history. It is true that Protestant countries have made earlier and more conspicuous displays of toleration than Catholic states, but even to this fact there are some remarkable exceptions. If it was not until after the French Revolution that Protestantism was permanently indulged in France, it was temporarily permitted by the Edict of Nantes, in 1598; while the Roman worship was not allowed in Sweden until 1781. It is also well to remember that, at the time the Puritans were burning for witchcraft, and exiling Roger Williams into the wilderness, the Catholic colony of Maryland had taken the most tolerant grounds with respect to liberty of conscience. At this day, every Protestant country in Europe (except perhaps the Swiss cantons) aims to depress all creeds but one by maintaining a state church, and, in so doing, falls short of absolute toleration.

With us the case is different. The principle of religious liberty, urged by Jefferson before the House of Burgesses in Virginia, and afterwards embodied in the statutes of that State, is now fixed by the Federal Constitution, and wrought into the household words of the people. Relieved from the coil of state influence and the curse of state aid, an enthusiast might have indulged the hope that the church would now return to her apostolic practice, and appear once more as a purely spiritual body, sustained by purely spiritual power. It soon appeared, however, that her mediæval training had not been in vain, and that she was not easily to be divorced from that temporal authority with which she had been so long and closely allied. Having lost all but the tradition of that self-contained energy with which she had laid the foundations of her immortal empire, she now sought to obtain from society that secular aid which she had grown to believe indispensable, and which she could no longer receive from the government. It may not be superfluous to detail a few of the methods by which (in part, perhaps unwittingly) she has absorbed, without reforming, worldly and unprincipled men—a policy by which she has added to her numbers and her wealth, but has given to her reputation, conventions, and moral conduct that unspiritual character described in our title as her “secularization.”

In the first place, she has preached the restoration of that system of business support and social visitation *within* her communion that was the custom and necessity of early times, but which could then have been no allurement to the worldly, since she was, at the best, but a small and despised organization. Now, however, that her influence and her patronage are immense, it may well be questioned whether the false professions of faith to which a state church tempts the political aspirant are more corrupting than the same professions from those who only seek financial profit or social elevation. It is difficult to see why an unregenerate man, who does good work, is unworthy of Christian patronage, while it is very clear that, if it is denied to him, he will become either a hypocrite within the church, or a fierce enemy entrenched against her. It is also evident that general visiting, *merely* on the ground of a nominal religious fellowship, degrades the church into a means of social aggrandizement, and furnishes another worldly impulse to religious profession. The specious argument is sometimes offered that the union of temporal with spiritual interests does not diminish the latter, while it adds to the grounds of our church attachments. This position is, however, refuted both by psychology and history. In France, the Huguenots flourished during the persecutions antecedent to the Edict of Nantes, but when, under the administrations of Henry IV., Richelieu, and Mazarin, they were eligible to the highest civil and military posts, it became apparent that they were rapidly declining. The cause of this phenomenon is as deep as the roots of the heart. Two opposite motives cannot each be supreme, and, when temporal and spiritual interests are united, the former (because immediate)

will almost invariably dominate. Hence, the French conversions to Romanism in the seventeenth century, and hence the multitude of worldlings in our existing church.

The marked efforts which are made to secure the “conversion” of rich and influential persons are, unfortunately, too notorious; while the indulgence which is displayed to their vices, when they are once within the fold, forcibly suggests the Feejeean custom of requiring twice the evidence to convict a rich man that would doom a poor one. It is a curious instance of moral compensations that the state church, with all its evils, is less liable to this frantic courtship of the high and mighty than those organizations which are not governmentally endowed. It may suffer from being degraded by the world, but it is not degraded by being itself a courtier. The free church of this country has further contributed to its secularization by indulging pew-holders who are not church-members with a vote in the election of its clergy. In this way, the world has frequently held the balance of power in so important a matter as the choice of a pastor, and has expressed its taste by filling our pulpits with carnal and sensational men—speculators in the Lord’s vineyard, who foot up their so-called “conversions” as a banker does his accounts.

In some respects, the secularization of the church is to be lamented as one of the unavoidable effects of the age. Those social movements that have awakened the female mind from its former apathy to everything but emotional and domestic concerns have also roused it to the incalculably useful passion for management and combined effort. In short, women are beginning to experience the instinct for club organization, by which they can better effect their purposes, gratify their gregarious tastes, and display their individual powers in labor and command. The church, which may be considered as a religious club, is almost the only institution ready to receive them, and absolutely the only one which is fitted to their present tastes. Completely organized, it demands nothing of their fledgling skill, while the narrow but useful sphere to which it limits their exertions relieves them from a responsibility which they feel unable to meet. It is the vague yet impassioned desire to do something, to express themselves somehow, in some way to bind themselves to the outside world, which leads hosts of women to join the church, who, as men, would unite with a business, scientific, or social club. Of course, such characters reflect small credit on their religious profession, and, indeed, by their distressing combination of red-hot zeal in all church labors with unsanctified dispositions, wreck the happiness of many a way-worn shepherd. Another difficulty under which the church necessarily labors was suggested in these columns some time since, and arises from the refined and, as it were, unobtrusive vices of these times. The moral corruptions of our day break inwardly, and hence the guardians of Zion are specially subject to deception respecting the real character of those who would make a profession of faith.

The agencies above enumerated have been chiefly instrumental in bringing about that ecclesiastical secularization which is none the less disastrous because it has produced a delusive prosperity. In the sixteenth century, the Papal Church bent all her energies toward the erection of an unrivalled temple, that should for ever attest the splendor and the magnitude of her resources. St. Peter’s was completed; but, to obtain the needful funds, those rash and unholy means were employed which were the proximate cause of the great religious rebellion, and which inflicted the first serious wound upon the Catholic Church. Thus, as the house which was “made with hands” developed the vain show of its superb proportions, the spiritual temple began to decay. This generation may learn from the past, and not imitate the example of those hasty children who blow their bubbles till they break with their increase and the shattered rainbow disappears in vapor.

Correspondence.

THE ENGLISHWOMEN AND THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me, as a diligent and generally approving reader of the *Nation*—the letters of your London correspondent inclusive—to take marked exception to the first paragraph of his communication

under date of May 13? The writer gives his testimony in favor of the Contagious Diseases Act, and states that "its operation has done much good to the troops, and to the population of the towns where it is in operation, and that it is more likely to be extended than to be repealed." He has a right to his opinion, but not to speak as he has done of the large number of English, Scotch, and Irish ladies who regard the *acts* (for there are *two*) as cruel, unjust, tyrannical, and immoral; who are laboring for their repeal, and are acting for this object with such unity, ability, devotion, and energy, and in such numbers, that they can hardly fail to succeed. You will agree with me that their success is at least probable when they have the countenance of such men as John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Rev. James Martineau, Professor F. W. Newman, Rev. F. D. Maurice, and many other eminent guides of English opinion, who differ widely on other subjects. Amongst the ladies, I will only name Harriet Martineau; Florence Nightingale; Elizabeth Pease Nichol; Jane and Eliza Wigham, of Edinburgh; John Bright's two sisters, Priscilla McLaren and Margaret Lucas; Helen T. Bright Clark, his daughter; Ursula M. Bright, his sister-in-law; Anna M. Haslam, of Dublin; Mary A. Estler, of Bristol; Madame Venturi, of London; and Josephine E. Butler, of Liverpool, who may be regarded as the recognized leader of the ladies of England in their opposition to the acts. This lady was until lately president of the National Association for the Higher Education of Women, a position which she resigned solely from a sense of duty, in order that she might devote herself more completely to her present far more arduous and invidious presidency of the ladies' association for the repeal of the obnoxious acts. She is also widely known as the editor of a series of admirable essays by various writers, lately published by Macmillan, entitled "Woman's Work and Woman's Culture," of which the very best portion is an introduction of remarkable literary excellence and moral beauty contributed by herself. These names are selected from a list of more than five hundred, many of whom are known to myself, and, as generally happens in all useful movements, a large proportion of them are members of or are connected with the Society of Friends. These are not the kind of people who do their work by *shrieking*, as your correspondent infers, nor by "unladylike appeals to buncombe;" nor are they of those who "think that argument is irrelevant, or that they see to the bottom of the complicated question by a species of intuition, and answer tables of statistics by texts from Scripture." Whilst many physicians favor the acts, very many of equal eminence agree with the women in abhorrence of their unjust operation and their immoral tendency. Of this number is a considerable proportion of the faculty in this city, which is celebrated as a school of medicine and surgery.

The term "Contagious Diseases Acts" is a decent name for measures assumed to be called for by the evils incident to the enforced celibacy of the rank and file of the army and navy. Their provisions do not attempt to limit prostitution, but to render it more safe for the debauched men, whilst they include severe and revolting enactments against the unhappy women. In conclusion, I would particularly beg your attention to "A Few Words in Reply to the Editor," in the May number of the *Fortnightly Review*. It is from the pen of Madame Venturi, one of those illogical shriekers whom your correspondent alludes to.

RICHARD D. WEBB.

DUBLIN, IRELAND, June 30, 1870.

[Our London correspondent would, we know, have a good deal to say in reply if he were here, and some of it we may be allowed to say for him. We do not believe it ever entered into his head to doubt the general goodness and purity and praiseworthiness of the ladies engaged in this agitation against the Contagious Diseases Acts. Everybody knows, too, that there are amongst them women of the highest character and social position, and women who have already done good service in the cause of humanity and science. But then all these things do not diminish the anxiety with which their methods inspire those who look forward to see women taking an active part in the work of legislation. We think we are not exaggerating when we say that nothing in this country, at least, has done so much to hinder, if not indefinitely postpone, the admission of women to the franchise, as the advocacy of it during the last two or three years by a body of women, of whom a large number enjoy, *as women*, the respect and esteem of everybody who knows them. We believe they have succeeded in satisfying a large portion of the community that female suffrage would be a great calamity; that if worse women than these acquired much political influence, they would

increase greatly the abuses from which the body politic is already suffering; while if the best women of the present movement are fair representatives of the female politicians of the future, their exercise of political power would result in attempts to make the moral law, as they understand it, and the law of the land conterminous, thus reviving a system of government which has been the source of the greatest calamities which have befallen mankind, of which the government of priests is a fair specimen, and which among weak races would result in a state of society like that of China, and among strong ones in a state of society like that of Spain and Mexico. We shall not go into particulars in support of this view, because it would involve a discussion of the Contagious Diseases Acts, with which, we are glad to say, there is no occasion to trouble American readers. We may add that we are ourselves all but convinced of the inexpediency of this legislation; but we owe our conversion—if conversion it can be called—to the exceedingly able paper of Dr. Simon, the Medical Officer of the Privy Council. On such contributions as the ladies have made to the controversy we hope never to see legislation based in any civilized country, and we have read most of them—the principal ones certainly. Take, as an illustration of what we mean, one of the tracts of the association which Mr. Webb forwards us—a paper read by Mrs. Josephine Butler at "a conference of delegates from associations and committees formed in various towns for promoting the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts." The subject is "The Moral Reclaimability of Prostitutes"—a very interesting one, one on which the public naturally looks to these ladies for much light, and one bearing strongly on the matter in dispute. Mrs. Butler is an excellent lady, who has done much good work in her day, and who is probably known to American readers as the editor of the volume of essays of which Mr. Webb speaks; so we took up her pamphlet with a good deal of eagerness, hoping for some information as to the results of honest labor in this great field of human misery. What did we find? We shall present a list of the propositions she lays down, and, in doing so, shall scrupulously avoid any approach to caricature:

1. It surprised her so much to be asked to write a paper on such a subject "that it took away her breath for a moment." It was as if "she had been asked to write a paper to prove that trees regain their leaves in spring."

2. "It is a fact that such women are being constantly reclaimed;" but she questions whether the most powerful reasoning would convince anybody who believes in his heart that they are irreclaimable. If any one doubts it, the fault is in his heart and character. "A single look at a man's face is enough to tell her whether it is of any use to ask him to aid in the reclamation of fallen women." The best way of convincing people is to take them among the fallen women; but in many cases this would be useless, as the very presence of some persons "paralyzes the good there is in the outcasts." [In other words, the only use of arguing on this subject is to convince the convinced, and persons of unsatisfactory physiognomy are not worth persuasion. It seems to the unregenerate male mind, however, as if a few figures, such as M. du Camp gives in his recent articles in the *Journal des Economistes* on this subject, conveying the results of the labors of such institutions as those of the Dames Diaconesses and the Ouvroir de Notre Dame de la Miséricorde, and of the Nouveau Bon Pasteur in Paris, would reduce the most hardened infidels, if not to penitence and good works, at least to silence.]

3. "The minds of prostitutes are greatly distracted by speculations with regard to the prodigality of men," and they consider "the reclaimability of profligate men doubtful, because of the hypocrisy of their lives."

4. Humility is not infrequently found in the character of outcast women. They do not excuse or defend their sinful life.

5. It is "foolish" and "a crime" and "utterly silly" to generalize about fallen women. Many sin from hunger.

This is the whole of the pamphlet. We have faithfully reproduced every leading proposition it contains. The point treated at most length in it is the hypocrisy of men.—ED. NATION.]

DALL'S ALASKA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Trusting to the proverbial justice of the *Nation*, I ask an opportunity in your columns of refuting some serious misrepresentations, and defending myself against an unmerited reproach contained in a criticism in your issue of the 7th on "Alaska and its Resources."

The points to which I refer are as follows:

1. The statement is made that I have left unmentioned the explorations of Capt. Raymond and their results; and the inference is directly drawn that it was done intentionally from unworthy motives. Was it want of care or of candor which omitted, after quoting the expression, "This completes the history of the explorations of the Yukon," to notice the qualifying phrase of the paragraph, five lines below, "previous to July, 1868, as far as is known to me"?

It was never my intention to carry the historical notes on the Territory beyond the date of the transfer, and at the time the above words were written Captain Raymond had not reached San Francisco on his return. The position of Fort Yukon was communicated verbally to me by that gentleman long afterward, and was then inserted in the electrolyte plates which had already been cast. That I did not acknowledge this courtesy in the preface was due to the fact that it was already printed. His preliminary report, which, however, contains nothing new except the position of Fort Yukon, is duly referred to in the Appendix. It is to be presumed that his final report will not long be delayed, and in it we may anticipate a valuable contribution to North American geography.

2. The reviewer objects to my strictures on a certain map as "decidedly less than magnanimous" toward Mr. Whymper. Assuming the criticism to be made in good faith, it appears that he cannot have read my remarks nor examined the said map. Not a word can be found in the whole volume in any way reflecting upon Mr. Whymper or his work, and the assumption that I have so reflected is destitute of any foundation in fact. The facts are these: Mr. Whymper did not construct the map which accompanies his book, nor is there any evidence that he assisted in its construction. Mr. Arrowsmith, as I distinctly state in the remarks referred to (p. 291), and as the map itself bears evidence, constructed and drew it from Mr. Whymper's bearings and notes, and from Zagoskin's map; and, *in so doing, introduced several gross errors*, not appearing in the latter nor warranted by Mr. Whymper's notes, if, as I suppose, they agreed in substance with my own. This "more than reprehensible" carelessness in a professed geographer called forth my criticism, with the remark that it should be "a warning to future explorers to be careful into whose hands they put their information." How this can be twisted into "an invidious allusion to the legitimate labors of a fellow-traveller" passes my comprehension! The result for Mr. Arrowsmith is, however, that instead of being wrong to the extent of thirty-eight minutes in latitude and one degree and forty-six minutes in longitude (as my "few compass bearings and skilful guesses" brought me), he has gone wrong, from nearly the same data, to the extent of fifty-eight minutes in latitude and two degrees and twenty-four minutes in longitude, besides introducing several gross and *unnecessary errors*. I hope this will be sufficient to repel the baseless charge of petty meanness toward other explorers, which I feel the more deeply as my most earnest endeavor throughout the book has been to do the most impartial justice to every explorer who had visited the Territory up to the date of writing, "July 1868, as far as was known to me."—I remain, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. H. DALL.

WASHINGTON, July 9, 1870.

[We of course did not know that it was "never Mr. Dall's intention to carry the historical notes on Alaska beyond the date of the transfer." We presumed his purpose to be, as he defines it in the very first sentence of his preface, "to comprise in a small compass the most valuable part of the present knowledge of Alaska. His "qualifying phrase" was omitted by us because it does not affect, grammatically or logically, his unqualified statement that his account "completes the history of the explorations of the Yukon." The sentence in which it occurs, and the only one which it qualifies, *merely enumerates the white persons who, up to the date mentioned, had been upon the river*. The mention of the title of Captain Raymond's report, under the head of "Executive Documents," in the Appendix, does not invalidate our statement that the steamer expedition of 1869, in many respects the most remarkable journey ever made on the Yukon, is nowhere mentioned by Mr. Dall. If it was not proper to take notice of this exploration before

the party got back to San Francisco, a sentence or two on the subject might have been subsequently added in the Appendix or elsewhere, together with other matter which Mr. Dall appears to have found no difficulty in introducing.

We were aware that Mr. Dall affects in his book to disclaim the application of his severe comments upon the map of Whymper and Arrowsmith to the former gentleman; and we must adhere to our opinion, nevertheless, that these comments do reflect upon Mr. Whymper. Accepting Mr. Dall's declaration of an earnest desire to do impartial justice, we must point out to him that the map in question was constructed from the notes of Mr. Whymper, presented by him to the Royal Geographical Society, and published in his book. Mr. Whymper is as much responsible for it as Mr. Dall for the sketch which accompanies his own book. If unnecessary errors should be discovered in Mr. Dall's map (and the course laid down for the Stikine River, though tardily atoned for in a note, might be called by a severe critic a quite "unnecessary" blunder), would it be fair to assail vehemently the person who constructed and drew the map, presuming that he did not follow the notes given him? Mr. Dall's strictures are none the less severe upon Mr. Whymper for being nominally directed against Mr. Arrowsmith. "Qualifying phrases" must be more skilfully applied if they are to turn aside the force of language so strong and clear. Moreover, Mr. Arrowsmith's experience as a map constructor is far greater than Mr. Dall's, and should protect him against such assaults of conjectural criticism.—ED. NATION.]

A QUESTION FOR MR. JAMES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Has Mr. Henry James anywhere indicated the methods by which he would secure a substantial amelioration of the marriage state? I mean *practical* methods, such as plain people can understand, and within which they may at once begin to labor. If, for instance, he invokes the aid of legislation, what should be the nature and scope of the bill which a legislator, so minded, should propose? If he relies upon education, what book or books should a school committee, with his proposed reform at heart, prescribe as text-books?

C. I. S.

ATCHISON, KAN., July 9, 1870.

Notes.

LITERARY.

MESSRS. LEE & SHEPARD announce three reprints of books for children, of which one at least will be welcomed. They are: "The House on Wheels, or the Stolen Child," which is translated from the French, and is illustrated with twenty engravings; "Letters Everywhere," consisting of stories and rhymes for children; and the last year's book of Mr. Lewis Carroll—"Behind the Looking-Glass, and what Alice Found There," the Alice being the Alice of "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland," and the new volume being profusely illustrated by Tenniel.—Messrs. Sever & Francis will publish translations of a story by Björnson, entitled "Railroad and Churchyard," of a story called "Old Oiaf," by Thoreson, another Scandinavian writer; and of a story by Goldschmidt with the title of "The Flying Mail."—Harper & Brothers announce a volume to be called "The Life and Speeches of Charles Dickens." Here we may properly mention the fact that Mr. John Forster, the biographer of Goldsmith and of Landor, and a most intimate friend of Dickens, is understood to be engaged to write his life. People who have read the Landor, and not the Goldsmith, may by possibility have their doubts about Mr. Forster's being the best man to do the work; but those who know both the lives we mention will expect an admirable book. For that matter, the "Life of Landor," if imperfectly appreciative of Landor's character, and too eulogistic of his powers of mind and the value of his works, is nevertheless a very interesting mine of literary history, biography, criticism, and anecdote. The man on vacation who wants but one book with him could hardly find a better book than this one to put into his trunk, and it would last a lazy reader a reasonably long vacation too.—Messrs. Fields & Osgood announce that they will publish in book-form the sketches of an Englishwoman's life at the court of the late King of Siam, of which some, but not the best, have already appeared in the *Atlantic*.—Messrs. Roberts Brothers, who, more than any other of our publishers, convey by their selection of books for publication the dis-

inctive impression of taste, are going to republish the now somewhat dimly famous "Margaret," by Sylvester Judd. All critics who have read it speak very highly indeed of this novel, and declare that, except Hawthorne, no one comes near Mr. Judd's excellence as a maker of the New England novel. There will, at all events, be satisfaction and refreshment in going back to the fountain-head again; certainly, for some time the lower parts of the stream of New England novels have afforded pretty rapid drinking. The same house will publish in the fall Jean Ingelow's new volume.—A novel which will deal with other than Eastern phases of American life is promised in the *Galaxy*. The West Point officer stationed in the West is to figure in it, we believe, and he is a comparatively new personage in any of the respectably high regions of fiction, though the Dime novels have had something to say of him. Mr. De Forest is the only good writer that we can recall who has had luck in depicting the West Pointer as he appears after having undergone a certain amount of frontier demoralization. The author of the new story is for the present anonymous.

—A correspondent writes to ask where he may find, if he may find at all, these works of Cooper's: "An Autobiography of a Pocket Handkerchief," "Gleanings in Europe," "Letter to my Countrymen," "The American Democrat," "Sketches in Switzerland," "Sketches in France," "Sketches in Italy," "Sketches in England," and "The Middle States of America." We think that all of these works are long out of print, if indeed it is not true that one of them, the "Autobiography of a Pocket Handkerchief," never was in print in book-form, but appeared only as a magazine story. The various tours are, we believe, in two volumes each, except the tour in Switzerland, which is in four volumes, and the whole set of them, eight or ten in all, may still be picked up in the second-hand book-stores. Mr. W. Gowans, for instance, of 115 Nassau Street in this city, could, no doubt, supply our correspondent with them, and also with the "American Democrat" and the "Letter to my Countrymen." These latter, which are more valuable than the others, as being very full of Cooper in his most aggressive self-assertiveness, and being roundly abusive and arrogant, and also as being marked books in our literary history, are of more than one edition; but the tours, which are of small interest, were never, we think, printed more than once. Still, as we say, all can probably be got. Messrs. W. A. Townsend & Adams, publishers, of this city, could perhaps give our correspondent some information on this point if he desires any. We observe that Allibone says that the old firm of which Mr. Townsend was the principal member, once made "a complete edition of Cooper's works." This statement is meant, we take it, to cover only the author's works in fiction, for on the next page, in a list furnished Mr. Allibone by Mr. Townsend's firm, we count just thirty-four titles, all of novels, and of all the novels; and we suppose that there was never a really complete edition of Cooper's works in every field of literature which he cultivated. But Mr. Gowans or Mr. Townsend, either of them, is better informed on the subject than we are. The neglect of Cooper, which our correspondent thinks remarkable and rather lamentable, seems to us not injudicious nor undeserved. Such of his works as are good are, we suppose, the most popular novels at all the circulating libraries—more popular than even Dickens's at the Boston Public Library, let us say. It is the trash which he wrote hastily, and which he should not have consented to write, that the world now very properly and very kindly allows to sleep.

—Mr. Steiger, a German publisher of this city, whose name must be known to most of our readers, has hit upon a scheme which is interesting and which bids fair to be very useful. Everybody knows who has any familiar acquaintance with our German fellow-citizens that though they are nothing like so clannish as the Irish, and for that reason, and for the further reason that people of American blood and people of German have so much in common, they, nevertheless, give up unwillingly their nationality, do not at once become Americanized, and do not easily reconcile themselves to the thought that their children are to be out-and-out Americans. Their press in this country does much to foster this feeling, which is, of course, a natural feeling enough, and the outcry was great when some time since, in his "History of German Emigration to America," Mr. Frederick Kapp asserted that the hope of building up a new Germany in this country is an idle one; that the German immigration to the United States comes in contact with a defined, well-settled, powerful nationality, which has proved its ability to absorb other races, and which now cannot succumb to any foreign elements, nor be held off from assimilating them. German influence is most visible now at the West, for there it has founded new townships; but there the powerful American influence is permeating more and more thoroughly day by day, and to dream of a Germanesque

Utopia in America is, Mr. Kapp would say, merely to dream. We are all to be Americans together—the American of the future doubtless getting a new tinge from the various new ingredients that are mixing with the blood of his fathers and mothers, but still being distinctively American, and not a new order of German or Irishman or Englishman. These views provoked, as we have said, a loud outcry in the German-American press, and Mr. Kapp received a good deal of undeserved and hasty abuse, of which some was bestowed on what were really his views, but much more on an exaggerated conception of them. These themselves we have given, substantially; but he was charged with a wish to make all Germans at once turn Americans, and even give up the use of the German speech. The matter has set itself right by this time, we imagine, and we should say that there is a much more general assent given to the opinion of Mr. Kapp than was given when his work first appeared. It is proper, by the way, to say that it is one of several works by the same learned and philosophical author which ought to be more generally read by Americans than they are. The "Life of Steuben," the "Life of De Kalb," the "History of American Slavery," the "History of the Soldier Traffic by German Princes in the American Revolutionary Period," are historical works of real research and real ability. Probably it is to Mr. Kapp's "History of German Emigration" and the controversy thereupon arising that we owe the scheme of Mr. Steiger's devising which we have mentioned. He intends to give prizes for essays bearing on German life in America; the first essay to be a "Historical Sketch of the Intellectual Vigor and Progress of the German Population of North America, and especially of the Influence of the German-American Press upon American Institutions." This is a very interesting topic, and ought to be fruitful of good writing. The prize, too, is a good one, and sufficient to stimulate men of real ability, for it is the unusually large one of eight hundred dollars. Should the experiment turn out well, Mr. Steiger will follow it up by propounding for discussion questions kindred in nature to the one above given, and offering for each a prize of the same value. The result will not, we hope, fail to be a little library of very good essays. In the *Literarischer Monatsbericht* for July those who are interested in the subject will find full particulars.

—It is, no doubt, a useful custom which exists in many, if not all, of our colleges—that of compiling statistics of each class as it is on the point of graduating; but it has for some of its results things that are absurd and disagreeable. Perhaps if the spirit is there, we may as well have the letter—though this we doubt—but certainly the printing of statistics such as these, for example, does nothing to raise the reputation of American colleges. We copy from the "Statistics of the Class of 1870 of Yale College":

"Turn we next to corrupted or abbreviated names and nicknames. In this particular our class can hold its own with any of its predecessors. Of the first class there are the following:

"Back, Beack, Betsy, Bonus, Carp, Del, Nate, Joth, De, Fafner, Josh alias Fe, Hess, Hoad, Jenks, Janz alias Janst, Kel (2), Link, Phil alias Philip alias Philander alias Philemon alias Lin, Tomp (y), Cutch alias Scutch (eon), Mart, Mascé, Met alias Calf, Perk, Rile, Rob, Schaife alias Saif alias Skaife alias Scaipo alias Shate alias Lauri, Shep, Silli alias Shyleman, Swain, Tom, Van alias Schoony, Word. Of the nicknames, a number are omitted, as being used rarely or by only one or two intimate friends. The following are considered worthy of record—in this, as in the preceding list, those most used being put first, when there is any choice: Pill alias Champion alias Shanks Lazy, Beer-barrel, Wicked Rascal, Bumner, Baron Von Mauch Chunk alias Barney the Baron alias Old Innocence alias Cook alias Doctor alias Nicky Nubble, Ricardi alias Charpont alias Carpe diem, Zack, Spoon, Stub, Pater alias Dad, Old Business, Jock, Pus alias Jack alias Dicker alias Das Grose alias Fat Rascal alias Squaw, Daniel, Judge, Fagan the Jew, Marcus Aurelius," and so forth and so forth, to the extent of a hundred more.

This is a sort of inane vulgarity to which one would suppose a four years' course of the humanities would make it impossible that young men past their majority should descend. It would hardly be pleasing to us to have applied here Mr. Matthew Arnold's principle of judging of the civilization and culture of a community by the names which its members bear. "The girl Wragg" was, we believe, the designation that gave him pause, and set him moralizing on the inherent delicacy and loveliness of British nature as made manifest even in its nomenclature. The strength of brain and the polish of our average undergraduate would no doubt afford matter for some of his peculiarly civil speculation if he were to come upon the list given above. Here is another item deemed important enough for publication. "C takes the lead in the line of surname initials, boasting twenty-three representatives, of seven of whom it has been bereaved; but B suffers most of all, having lost twelve out of twenty-one. J, Q, U, X, Y, and Z have been unknown in '70, and we regret to say that of the others all but E have lost some of

their representatives, from one cause or another." The terms "bereavement" and "loss" refer, no doubt, to suspensions or expulsions, or both. Not so silly perhaps—though we are not sure about that—but perhaps more vulgar and offensive is a custom which, as we guess from the same "Statistics," Yale still keeps up, as also, we believe, Harvard does—the custom, namely, of collecting a certain sum of money—generally as many dollars as the number (above 1800) of the class's year of graduation—and holding it as a fund for the purchase of a cradle, which is given to the member of the class who shall first become the father of a child. Much more honored in the breach than the observance are all such customs, and it is a pity that there is hardly a college in the country which is not given over to a greater or less amount of such puerility and folly. Faculties are practically powerless in the matter, and there is nothing to be done but wait for the more thorough emancipation and culture of the average undergraduate.

—From the sensible part of the work of the Yale compilers we learn that the average age of the young men who have just been graduated is 23 yrs. 6 mos. and 14 days. The youngest of the 113 graduates of this year was 19 yrs. 5 mos. and 24 days; while the oldest was 27 yrs. 6 mos. and 3 days, and appears not to have entered college till after he had gone through the war—in fact, not till after he had gone through a term of imprisonment at Andersonville. Of the classes immediately preceding this one, the average age seems to have been about the same with that just given. The average age of the class of '69 was 23 yrs. and 29 days; of '68, 22 yrs. 4 mos. 28 days; of '67, 22 yrs. 3 mos. 19 days; of '66, 22 yrs. 4 mos. 17 days. Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio furnish a very heavy majority of the graduates; while of the Southern States, only Louisiana, Kentucky, Maryland, and Tennessee appear in the list, and they are represented by but six men. Eighty, on the other hand, is the number of men representing the four Northern States we have named, Connecticut having 32 out of this number, New York 28, Pennsylvania 12, and Ohio 8. Massachusetts claims 9 of the 113. The New England element being thus strong, it is not surprising to learn that the class of '70 contains 52 Congregationalists—or at least persons who attend Congregationalist churches—31 Presbyterians, and 3 Baptists—a leaven of Calvinism which ought to keep all New Haven sound. Most of these Calvinists, too, are church-members; not less than 44 of the Congregationalists communicate, and of the whole class, 64 per cent. were members of some church. Unitarianism seems not to have existed in '70; but there were 17 Episcopalians, of whom 6 were communicants, 3 Methodists, 1 Universalist, 1 "Christian," 1 Lutheran, 1 Romanist, and 1 Quaker. 26 men "drink," 56 smoke, 8 chew tobacco, 7 "drink, smoke, and chew," 11 "smoke and drink," 87 play cards, and 83 dance—on the whole, not a bad showing, if the figures are accurate. But, then, doubtless the college communities are as free from vicious practices as any secular communities in the country. The vast majority of American college students work faithfully and behave themselves well. The average weight of these young Americans of twenty-two and a half years is 148 5-7ths pounds, and their average girth of chest something more than 36 inches. The average height is 5 feet 8 9-10ths inches. The predominant complexion would seem to be light, or, at any rate, not to be called dark. Blue and gray eyes were to hazel, brown, and black as 70 to 43; and men with black hair were but 18 in number, while those with red or light brown hair were 36, and those with darker brown 59.

—The American traveller who has seen Rome doubtless remembers the two colossal equestrian statues on the Quirinal Hill, or, as the modern Italians call it, Monte Cavallo. These statues bear respectively the inscriptions "Opus Phidias," "Opus Praxitels," and, by general consent, have long been attributed to Praxiteles and Phidias. Winckelman gave this opinion the force of authority by adopting and advocating it. But archaeologists and artists have since Winckelman's day exchanged doubts as to the generally accepted origin of these superb works, and now agree that not only were they not intended to represent Castor and Pollux, but could not have had the origin attributed to them. They were brought from Alexandria to Rome by order of the Emperor Constantine, and placed where they now stand by order of Pope Sixtus V. In 1865, Monsignor Falconieri, the editor of Nardi's *Roma Antica*, and the author of several treatises of recognized erudition, wrote a memoir upon these statues, in which he sets aside the Castor and Pollux theory, as also another which would make them represent Alexander taming Bucephalus, and shows that they were intended simply for horses in training by grooms for the public games and festivals of the day—a theory to us strongly borne out by our recollection of the total absence of nobility in the men's figures, which, although admirably executed, had received nothing at the hands

of the artist intended to make them heroic. The whole subject is thoroughly discussed in an octavo lately published in Rome, "I Colossi di Montecavallo," which includes the memoir of Falconieri above alluded to.

—The mention of Sixtus V. reminds us that Baron Hübner, the well-known diplomat who for so many years represented Austria at the principal courts of Europe, has lately given the literary world an excellent life of that distinguished Pope. Sixtus V. will be remembered as Cardinal Montalto, originally the son of a swineherd, who by his talents elevated himself to the highest honors, and on being elected in the Conclave threw away his crutches, etc. These are some of the traits which, according to popular tradition, mark his history. Baron Hübner makes short work with these and all other stories not warranted by strict history. His work is confined strictly to the relation of facts supported by documentary evidence, much of which, from the archives of Vienna, Rome, Paris, and Simancas, is now for the first time given to the world.

—The chair in the French Academy vacated by the death of M. Sainte-Beuve, has been awarded by vote to M. Jules Janin. The vacancies caused by the deaths of M. de Pongerville and the Duc de Broglie have been filled by the election of M. Xavier Marmier and M. Duvergier de Hauranne. M. Marmier had for concurrents and opponents MM. de Loménie, Rousset, Jules Lacroix, Edmond About, Laya, and Léon Halévy.

—As reasonably certain as anything we know of the history of so remote a period as fourteen hundred years ago is the fact that Attila, King of the Huns, surnamed the Scourge of God, invaded the countries of Gaul in the year 451, sacked Treves, Worms, Mentz, Arras, and several other cities, and was finally defeated, with great loss, by the combined Roman and Visigoth forces under Aetius, Theodoric, and Thorismond. Two battles, it is said, were fought—one near Orleans, in which Theodoric was killed; the other at Mauriac. The second battle (Campus Mauriacus) was the decisive defeat, and while perfectly willing to believe that many Huns came to grief on that occasion, we decline accepting the statements of the chroniclers that Attila's loss amounted to 200,000 men killed. For the past thirty years a vehement archaeological-historical controversy has raged in France as to the locality of those battles, and more especially of the Campus Mauriacus, to which Attila retreated after his first defeat. Twelve years ago, M. Amédée Thierry lavished a wealth of erudition on the subject in his "Histoire d'Attila," and the titles alone of the various treatises and essays on Attila's invasion published in France since that period would fill one of our columns. They contain, it is true, a great deal of matter purely local, inasmuch as the question turns upon the identification of a geographical point; but the discussion has thrown many singular lights on a variety of interesting questions, such as the history and character of the prominent men of the epoch, the composition of the barbaric armies, the method of combat, the style and management of weapons and armor, etc. The last and one of the very best essays on the subject is entitled "La Campagne d'Attila: Invasion des Huns dans les Gaules en 451, par Anatole de Barthélemy."

WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE COUNCIL.*

ALTHOUGH this trenchant brochure, which has already reached a second edition, is published anonymously, it is no secret that it is from the pen of M. Jules Gaillard, an attaché of the Cabinet of the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Paris, a devout Catholic, but of the enlightened and liberal school of Montalembert, Hyacinthe, Gratry, and the Archbishop of Paris. Until the seal of secrecy shall be broken, and the interior history of the Council exposed to the world, we may accept this as the most thorough, exact, and searching analysis of the constitution, the motives, and the working of the Council likely to be made by any one not a member of it, and as even more honest and impartial than a member could be expected to give. A preliminary section treats of the unwisdom of convening a council for the general objects vaguely presented in the original bull of indiction; for, as to science, "the spirit of research and analysis will not be discouraged by anathemas, and the sanctity of the faith could only be compromised by theological incursions upon the domain of observation and of pure reason;" and, as to civil affairs, the political and social problems now in process of evolution in modern society are not sufficiently resolved for the church to pronounce authoritatively upon the relations of these to the faith; in a word, the external questions which the Council was summoned to determine, either lie beyond the competence of the church, or are too inchoate for a dogmatic judgment.

* "Ce qui se passe au Concile." Paris: Henri Plon, Imprimeur-Editeur. 1870. Pp. 212.

On the other hand, as Gaillard, like Hyacinthe, affirms, the church itself has need of a reformation in its own order and discipline—a return to the principle of diocesan autonomy, a revival of that synodal activity that for fifteen centuries was her strength and glory, and a modification of the Sacred College that would admit the various Catholic nations to their proportionate representation, and replace the Roman Congregation by delegates from the clergy of the entire world. For such reforms it might have been worth while to convene a council; but nothing was further from the thought of Pius IX. and his advisers, and nothing is more hopeless in the Council as now constituted and controlled.

Soon after the Council was resolved upon, the intentions of the Roman Curia began to develop themselves in the very extraordinary methods of anticipating and shaping its labors and decisions. Preparatory commissions, appointed by the Pope and convened in a mysterious silence at Rome, were to ease the reverend fathers of the discussion of vexed questions, by well-digested dogmas, to be submitted to their approval. At the same time, the memory of Bossuet began to be disparaged, and his disciples were assailed as unfaithful to the unity of the church; it was assumed that the session of the Council would be brief; that it would readily accept the doctrines of the Syllabus, and by a supernatural afflatus would declare the dogmatic infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff; the Papal benediction was sent in advance to doctors, editors, and ecclesiastics who were forward to espouse this dogma, and those who showed opposition, or even hesitancy, were subjected to the petty annoyances which the Papal court knows so well how to direct against subjects that will not bend to its will. In these preliminary "symptoms," the direct urgency of the Pope for the dogma of Infallibility began to appear; but the whole scheme of the ultramontanists became patent in the composition of the Council, and the regulations imposed upon it by the three bulls promulgated at its opening—the *Multiplices Inter*, which deprived the fathers of the right of organizing their own body; the *Apostolica Predia*, which revived the anathemas of the famous Bull *In Cena Domini*; and the *Cum Romanis Pontificibus*, which commanded the indefinite adjournment of the Council in the event of the Pope's decease, though this last was according to precedent.

In analyzing the composition of the Council, Gaillard shows the alarming growth of centralization at Rome during the present century. One effect of popular revolutions resulting in the disunion of church and state, or rather in an antagonism between the state and the Papacy, as in South America, Italy, and Spain, has been to deprive the episcopate of a certain independence of Rome that it once possessed, and, by curtailing its resources and putting it under the ban of the civil power, to cast it absolutely into the hands of the Roman court. Bishops who once could use the temporal prince as an ally against the usurpations of Rome are now completely at the mercy of the Pope. Moreover, in England, Holland, and the United States, the bishops are of the Propaganda, whose discipline is like that of an army in the field. Of the 759 prelates having a voice in the Councils, 50 are cardinals, 100 apostolic vicars, 50 generals of orders and mitred abbots; more than 100 are bishops of the Propaganda; 276 are Italians, and of these 143 belong to the Pontifical States. Here are 580 presumably, with a few individual exceptions, in the interest of the Roman See, leaving but 180 representatives of churches—the German, the French, the Portuguese—that retain a certain autonomy. Of the 1,100 existing bishoprics in the Roman Catholic Church, 900 are to-day at the absolute disposal of the Pope. Well might *La Civiltà Cattolica* boast in advance that "the bishops of the whole world would be in such accord upon the main questions, that the minority, however eloquent it might be, would not be able to keep up an opposition."

This prediction has been verified in the course of the Council upon the dogma of Infallibility. The remonstrants have been able and eloquent, but their motives have been traduced, their voices silenced, their dignities threatened. The Pope, who at first affected to be restrained by modesty from taking the initiative upon the question of infallibility, at length sent to the Council a *schemata*, declaring that the infallibility of the Roman pontiff covers the same subjects to which the infallibility of the church now extends; and this was supported in various allocutions, letters, and official audiences, and by the devices of moral coercion in private. M. Gaillard shows that this dogma will work the destruction of the episcopate, and for bishops at the head of dioceses will substitute apostolic prefects. It will subject all forms of human science to the arbitrary censure of the Pope. It will annihilate within the church freedom of conscience and of will. It will lodge the power of anathema and of persecution in the caprice, and, it may be, the malice, of a single man, impersonating

the Inquisition in the Pope. In one word, the proclamation of the infallibility of the Pope is the consecration of theocracy—the declaration of religious absolutism in its highest form—the Pope the only church, and the sole organ of the divine oracles.

THE POPULATION OF AN OLD PEAR-TREE.*

A MOST charming as well as instructive little book, with more excellence, marred by less error, than is usual in popular presentations of natural history. Since Réaumur produced the six ponderous volumes of his "Mémoires," a hundred and thirty years ago, many authors of all nations have aimed to describe the life of insects, so as to interest and amuse, as well as instruct. But while all their endeavors have been more or less praiseworthy and useful, there is not one, from the time-honored "Introduction" of Kirby and Spence to Figuier's "Insect World," which does not convince the reader that to portray the doings of animals in a manner at once attractive and true to fact is no easy task. One work is too big, another too little; one is too dry with barren statement, another deluged with baseless fancies; one author has copied what he finds in his too convenient city library, another has seen things strangely, for lack of outside help; one describes the doings of beetles and bugs which are more or less interesting to him, as they destroy his crops, disturb his rest, or accomplish wonderful things among themselves; another sees in them the embodiments of his own passions and faculties, and falls to moralizing upon humanity good or bad, so often and so copiously that the ordinary reader is unable to follow or appreciate him, and lays down the "Episodes of Insect Life" with the wish that the entomology had been condensed into two volumes, and the sermons and metaphysics left for a third, which he might read when in want of mental gymnastics.

Our author is not altogether free from this tendency, but the most serious objection to his work is the very unnecessary employment of supernatural means in order to exhibit the population of the old pear-tree. He has taken a walk, and lain down at the foot of the tree; he falls asleep. So far it is very matter-of-fact; but then he says: "All at once my senses became marvellously acute. . . . I now saw the face of nature under a quite novel aspect—from the point of view of the smallest members of creation. . . . This is no exaggeration; I really saw what I describe," etc. Now, we may grant, if we like, that he went to sleep, and there are not many incredible statements of what he saw while sleeping; but, if he did go to sleep, he certainly saw nothing except in dreams, and dreams are not over-accurate in matters of fact; and, finally, it was perfectly easy for him, or any one else, to see all he says he saw while in a fully wakeful state. If the introduction were pure fancy or pure fact, no objection could be raised, but to mingle the two is like placing a mermaid in a museum of natural history, or pretending that your baboon is a gorilla. We hope the time may come when scientific writers will faithfully acknowledge truth to be stranger than fiction, and when fantastic and impossible fancies shall no longer be thought an indispensable appetizer for a wholesome meal from nature's storehouse.

There is one other matter in the introduction which needs mention. On page 10, the author alludes to the pain which he caused some insects by treading upon them. As an entomologist, he doubtless knew that there is abundant evidence that insects suffer little, if any, pain from injury and mutilation; indeed, it may be doubted whether any other organs than the antennae can suffer at all.

As was said at the outset, the statements are remarkably free from error; but a few corrections should be made. On page 13, it is said that the spider's mouth "bore a pair of mandibles and two hooks," and that these latter were "terminated each by a small hole;" more accurately, the hooks are the continuations of the mandibles or *falces*, and the holes are at the ends thereof. On page 14, the spinnerets are described as "four conical humps," with no allusion to the additional pair which all epeiridae possess, concealed between the other two pair.

The sound made by the mole-cricket is described by our author (page 22) as like "the tinkling of a silver bell;" but Kirby and Spence say it is "low, dull, jarring, and uninterrupted." The transformations of the cockchafer are said (p. 30) to occupy four years, while three is by far the more usual number. Why the "waving" of wings should cause them to fall is hard to understand (p. 64), and it is more likely that a more vigorous and unnatural movement is required to enable the ants to dislocate them.

The "obsequies of a field-mouse" are most interesting, but in the text

* "The Population of an Old Pear-tree; or, Stories of Insect Life. From the French of E. Van Brussel. Edited by the Author of 'The Heir of Redclyffe.'" New York: Macmillan & Co. 1870. 8vo, pp. 221. \$1 75.

no allusion is made to the female necrophorus, and the male is credited with all the labor, even to *laying the eggs*! But the engraving represents three beetles, which is just one more than would be welcome at such a funeral ceremony. The intimation is also made that for a necrophorus to raise a field-mouse is an impossibility; we have seen one of them raise a good-sized rat, and shift it along, so as to remove it a foot in a short time, in order to reach the hole in which it had been previously buried.

So much for adverse criticism upon the text. The illustrations are wonderfully good—correct, and spirited almost to perfection; but they are in many places strangely misplaced for ten or more pages, and may thus confuse, if not wholly mislead, the unentomological reader. The cuts are not even numbered or named; a predatory beetle appears among the description of ants; a number of other coleoptera dance a jig at the opening of a chapter on hymenoptera; further on, in the same chapter, a beetle performs upon the guitar; and last, and worst of all, the mole-cricket, described upon page 24, appears upon page 37, directly under a reference to a cockchafer. These are very serious faults of arrangement, and there is no excuse for them; but were there ten times as many, the cuts themselves are so uniformly excellent, the descriptions so lively yet correct, and the whole spirit of the author so fully in harmony with the best of nature's teachings, that we can only repeat our opening words, and add that "The Population of an Old Pear-tree" is not only one of the prettiest but one of the best little books upon insects that we have ever seen.

HESEKIEL'S "BISMARCK."*

HERR HESEKIEL is as thorough-going an admirer of Bismarck as Mr. Jean S. C. Abbott is of Napoleon. He sees in him not only a most successful statesman, exalted high above others, and "able to maintain himself even at the elevation at which God the Almighty has placed him for the good of his native country," a Prussian patriot in whose bosom "the fountain ever freshly runs whence he draws continual renovation for the service of his king," but also—what very few observers of his career have as yet seen in him—"a thoroughly honest politician—honest to such a degree that his political adversary is sometimes puzzled, and suspects some snare in his very openness." He asserts this with a bold face almost worthy of his subject, ready to "demonstrate the proposition," but defends himself against the possible suspicion of flattering a great minister and patron, by stating that he merely acknowledges "that his honesty has been implanted in the nature of Bismarck by the Almighty, that it could not but develop itself and become a sustaining principle," which makes it clear that in praising Bismarck he only means to praise the Lord. So much piety can certainly not surprise us in a man of the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, which Herr Hesekiel is, nor can so much admiration of Bismarck surprise us in a journalist who has so long fought with and under him "against liberalism and . . . the Mamelukes of this most evil despot."

Our author does not waste too many pages in demonstrating his proposition, filling his book chiefly with unpolitical as well as unphilosophical notices and anecdotes concerning the ancestry, the estates, the youth, the travels, and peculiarities of his hero—details tolerably interesting, perhaps, to a large portion of the Prussian public, but hardly of any interest to readers who have no Königgrätz to give thanks for—and with letters and extracts from speeches, meant to be illustrative of times, character, and political events—but so little and so poorly illustrative, in fact, as to leave the reader not otherwise informed in almost total darkness regarding the true character of recent Prussian history and of the statesman who so conspicuously figures in it. Nor do we intend wasting words in disproving our author's proposition or in showing up the real merits and demerits of his historico-biographical sketch—for this can hardly be considered a serious literary production; but we cannot refrain from quoting one anecdote and one letter out of the many contained in the "Life," in order to show what stuff can find a place in a German political panegyric, and find, besides, a British translator and an American republisher. Nor is the following the worst trash presented us in the form of either anecdotes or letters:

"Bismarck wished to reinvigorate himself by a thorough hunting-

party; he conferred with the Privy Councillor Oppermann, one of 'the mighty hunters' of Prussia; this gentleman joined him with enthusiasm, and communicated through the Oberförstermeister von Wedell, in Schleusingen, to obtain a woodcock foray with the famous shot Oberförster Klingner. Bismarck and Oppermann left Erfurt one morning together. At the first stage the travellers refreshed themselves at Arnstadt, as keen sportsmen, thinking nothing of the caddish opinions of the day, by a plentiful breakfast at eight o'clock, of delicate groundlings, and drank 1811 Bocksbeutel therewith. At the succeeding station they whetted their appetites with trout and drank beer with them, as the nectar of 1811 would allow no other wines to attract the palate. On their arrival at Schleusingen, at 3 P.M., they had more trout and beer; then an interview and arrangements with the Oberförster, and in the evening more trout, which Oppermann ate with wine-sauce, Bismarck remaining true to beer despite of urgent dissuasions. At night, about 12 o'clock, the Oberförster made his appearance with a keeper, to take the gentlemen off to the forest. Bismarck, however, was in a very lamentable plight; the mixture of fish and beer did not suit his constitution, and he was in a feverish state. He was advised to have some peppermint and stop in bed, but it was in vain; the keen sportsman was not afraid of stomach-ache; he was soon dressed, and away they went. Oppermann fired and killed a bird, but Bismarck returned home with nothing. . . ."

"BISMARCK TO FRAU VON ARNIM.—Schönhausen, 28th June, 1850.—I write you a solemn letter of congratulation on the occasion (I think) of your twenty-fourth birthday. (I won't tell anybody of this). You are now really a major, or, rather, would have been so, had you not had the misfortune to belong to the female sex, whose limbs [*sic* for members], in the eyes of jurists, can never emerge from minority—not even when they are the mothers of the lustiest of Jacks. Why this apparent injustice is a very wise arrangement I will instruct you when, I hope some fortnight hence, I have you *à la portée de la voix humaine* before me. Johanna—who at the present time is in the arms of Lieutenant Morpheus—will have written to you what is in prospect for me. The boy bellowing in a major key, the girl in minor, two singing nurse-girls, wet napkins and milk-bottles, myself in the character of an affectionate *paterfamilias*. I resisted a long time, but as all the mothers and aunts were unanimous that poor little Molly could only be cured by sea-water and air, I should, if I resisted any longer, have my avarice and my paternal barbarity paraded before me on the occasion of every cold the child will catch till it is seventy, with the words: 'Don't you see! Ah! if the poor child could but be gone to the sea-side!' The little being is suffering from the eyes, which are tearful and sticky. Perhaps this arises from the salt baths; perhaps from eye-teeth. . . ."

The above extracts will also serve to give our reader an idea of the merits of the English translation. Let us add that the latter, from beginning to end, swarms with most ludicrous Germanisms. The illustrations alone are faithfully reproduced, and, though of little merit, they form perhaps the most valuable portions of the book, excepting a few vigorously written and slightly instructive letters of Bismarck's.

Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100). (By E. A. Sophocles. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1870. Pp. xiv., 1188, 4to.)—Those who are busy counting up the sales of the last great novel by thousands and tens of thousands are probably not aware that a more remarkable book than the novel—in some respects the most remarkable book ever published in this country—has just been issued by Messrs. Little, Brown & Co., in a modest edition of less than three hundred copies. We are not using extravagant language when we say that Sophocles's Greek Lexicon does greater honor to American scholarship than any work in the combined fields of classical and sacred learning that was ever published. We doubt whether there is another man living who could have written the book; if there is one, we have never heard of him.

We have no hesitation in claiming this work for American scholarship. It is true Mr. Sophocles was born under the shadow of Mount Pelion, and spent part of his youth on Mount Sinai, and is withal much more familiar with the road to that mountain from the Nile than were ever the children of Israel; but we cannot feel that we have a slight claim on the fame of a scholar who came to America in his youth, entered as an undergraduate at a New England college, and has spent the greater part of his life in teaching Greek to American students.

Let no one imagine that this learned work is written for book-worms, or for men of profound learning only. On the contrary, it interests every one whose studies in the New Testament or the Septuagint ever carry him to the Greek; that is, it *ought* to interest every clergyman in America and England. Never was such a broad field of observation opened to the student of ecclesiastical Greek. Here is a scholar whose view comprehends the entire Greek language, in its unbroken course, from Homer to the newspapers of modern Athens. His erudition is not based merely on

* "The Life of Bismarck, Private and Political; with Descriptive Notices of his Ancestry. By John George Louis Hesekiel, author of 'Faust and Don Juan,' etc. Translated and edited, with an Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Appendices, by Kenneth H. Mackenzie, F.S.A., F.A.S.L. With upward of one hundred illustrations, by Diez, Grimm, Pletsch, and others." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

a university knowledge of classic Greek, and a study of the Sacred Writings themselves; but he includes in his studies a range of literature little known to modern theologians, which is of inestimable value in the early history of Christianity, and illustrates by its language every book of the New Testament itself. Viewed merely as a lexicon to the New Testament and the Septuagint, illustrated by references to all the contemporary literature, the work of Professor Sophocles is well worthy the attention of every clergyman, and of every student of the Bible. It is, in fact, by far the best dictionary of the New Testament that has ever been made; and the scholar who is without it is behind the age.

The present Lexicon is the result of many years' hard and patient labor. Even a native Greek cannot read Greek by the hundred volumes without time and patience. To any one who wishes to see the basis on which the work rests, we commend the twenty closely printed columns of "authors referred to" which precede the Lexicon. It would rather surprise us to hear of any one, except Mr. Sophocles, and perhaps some maker of a biographical dictionary, who is acquainted with all the authors in this list; and we should respect the learning of a man who knew one-fifth of them. It requires but a slight inspection of the Lexicon to see that Mr. Sophocles has made a thorough study of their language, and has used it conscientiously in illustration of his subject. Some of his articles are almost grammatical treatises, while, at the same time, the richness of illustration does not interfere with the systematic arrangement or the ease of reference. We would refer any mere classical scholar to the article *ἄνα*, for example, that he may see how far his classical knowledge would help him in understanding the later uses of this simple particle. This list of authors should especially gratify those through whose liberality Harvard College library has been able to supply so many books of reference; and if we are greatly indebted to the subscriptions of the gentlemen whose names are prefixed to the work for the means of publishing it, we must not forget the munificence of Mr. William Gray and Mr. Stephen Salisbury, to whom we are quite as much indebted for the means of writing it.

The first results of the studies of Professor Sophocles in this field were printed, in 1860, by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, as Vol. VII. of their Memoirs, under the title "A Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek." This work was really not published, as no copies were printed for sale, and the glossary itself filled only 480 pages of large type. The present Lexicon (apart from the introductory matter) fills 1132 closely printed pages, and is about three times as large as the Glossary. We find, for example, on opening the book at random, seventeen articles in the Glossary corresponding to fifty-two in the Lexicon; and the articles themselves, when repeated, are so enlarged and changed as to be really new. Once in a while we miss in the Lexicon a specimen of the author's peculiar exercise of his sense of humor which enlivened the less severe pages of the earlier work; for example, the definition of *Σηλότης* as "an epithet given to those holy men whose love of admiration demanded that they should spend the greater part of their lives on the tops of pillars in the vicinity of large cities;" and that of *ἡ ὁρθόδοξια*, *orthodoxy*, as "usually equivalent to *ἡ ἡμέτερα δόξα*, *our opinion*." We must not omit to call attention to the valuable introductions which precede the Glossary and the Lexicon. These contain a history of the Greek language through its various fortunes, and will be an authority on many disputed points. The remarks on the *Troparia* (the hymns and chants of the Greek Ritual), which are given in full only in the introduction to the Glossary, are valuable to those who are interested in church music.

A Manual of Ancient History from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire. (By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1869. 8vo, pp. 580.)—Mr. Rawlinson's "Manual of Ancient History" will be found a most useful book of reference. In respect to convenience of arrangement, clearness of statement, and general accuracy, it leaves nothing to be desired, and certainly has no rival in the field that it covers. We have found it especially satisfactory in the summaries that it gives of important groups or series of events, without entering into unimportant detail; such, for instance, as the legislation of Solon and the Gracchi, and the events of the Peloponnesian war.

In Oriental history, Mr. Rawlinson is himself an authority, and this outline will possess peculiar value. In Grecian history there are comparatively few obscure or difficult points, and the compiler has such good authority to follow in Grote, Hermann, and others, that there is little

temptation to go astray. The Roman part, too, is excellent so far as events are concerned, but the internal history is strangely deficient; evidently Mr. Rawlinson has neither made a minute study of this subject—as indeed was to be expected—nor chosen the best authorities to follow. It would appear that, discouraged by the lack of agreement in later enquirers, he had thought the safest thing was to throw overboard all discussions since Niebuhr, and follow implicitly the views of that writer. At any rate his account is, in the main, that of Niebuhr, including points which are now almost universally rejected.

The account of the early patrician constitution is on the whole good, and does not require any remark. So with the Servian constitution; whether Servius established thirty tribes, as Mr. Rawlinson says, following Dionysius, or only four, as Livy has it, is a comparatively trifling matter. It is well known, at any rate, that the number in B.C. 387 was twenty-one, so that, if there were originally thirty, there must be assumed a subsequent loss of territory of which we have no information. But we must object to the prominence which Mr. Rawlinson gives to the story that "it was said" that Servius intended to abdicate and establish a consular government—a wholly unlikely story, as it seems to us, and very far from being well supported by evidence. On page 348 this "is said," but on page 352 "Servius had designed," as if this alleged intention of a half-mythical king stood on the same footing of certainty with his centuriate and tribal organisms. On the other hand, we do not believe that Servius ever thought of *comitia* in connection with either the tribes or the centuries; it was not until the republic that these were used for legislative purposes.

The opinion that the first consul, Brutus, was a plebeian rests only upon the fact that the Bruti of the later republic were plebeians, and is wholly inconsistent with the general principles of the Roman constitution, as well as with the explicit statement of Livy (iv. 4), "*Nemo post reges exactos de plebe consul fuit*." On the other hand, that plebeians sat in the Senate, both at the commencement of the republic and a hundred years later, is stated with equal distinctness (Liv. v. 12). Such a statement, therefore, as the following—even though supported by the great name of Niebuhr—ought not to be put forward categorically, seeing that it is at best nothing but an arbitrary and doubtful hypothesis: "No plebeian was allowed to enjoy the consulship after Brutus, and by degrees it grew to be forgotten that any but patricians had ever been regarded as eligible. No plan was adopted by which plebeians could obtain regular entrance into the Senate; and, as their life-members died off, the council of the nation was once more closed to them" (p. 353). So with the statement on p. 359, that, "prior to the Decemvirate, for above thirty years, the patricians had claimed and exercised the right of appointing, by their own exclusive assembly, one of the two consuls"—a view of Niebuhr's, which, as Becker remarks, "rests only upon a forced interpretation of single expressions used by the writers, while the sense of the whole passage is neglected." Mommsen indeed has proved, or at least shown it to be highly probable, that there was in the republic no exclusive assembly of the patricians at all.

Apart from these very material points, there are a few other expressions here and there that show a lack of exactness in Roman antiquities. On p. 353-4, he speaks of the *addicti* as "actual slaves," while it is clear, from the fact that an emancipated *addictus* did not rank as a freedman, that these were only *quasi*-slaves. P. 355, it is remarked that "the Roman was a volunteer army, not a conscription." Now the Roman army was a true militia; every freeholder between the ages of seventeen and sixty was obliged to serve. P. 356, he says of the Publilian Law of Volero that its "main importance" was "that it assumed the initiation in legislation, hitherto in the hands of the other order"—not even mentioning the purport of this law, which Mommsen pronounces "one of the most momentous in its consequences with which Roman history has to deal"! P. 431, in mentioning the restoration of the power of the tribunes among the measures of Pompey and Crassus, in B.C. 70, by which the legislation of Sulla was repealed, this is said to imply "the consequent resuscitation of the tribes"—as if the *tribes* had ever been abolished. Probably he means the *power* of the tribes, as exerted in their *comitia*; it is at any rate very inaccurately expressed.

A still stranger confusion is found in the list of the Roman provinces (454)—"Spain, Gaul, Germany, Vindelicia, Rhetia," etc. Now, admitting that Vindelicia was an independent province—it is made a part of Rhetia by such authorities as Marquardt and Kiepert—each of those others mentioned above was only a territorial name, the territory being in each case divided into two or more provinces; Spain into three (called by Mr. Rawlinson "portions"), Gaul into four (called by him "regions"), Germany

into two (called by him "divisions"). Thus these five provinces were really ten or eleven.

But, while Mr. Rawlinson's view of Roman antiquities is defective, his Roman history is admirable. His views are sound, and he contrives to impart to it a remarkable degree of vigor and life for so brief a compend.

Seventy-five Popular Flowers, and How to Cultivate them. By Edward S. Rand, jr. (Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1870.)—Mr. Rand treats of things new and old in an earnest way which enlists our sympathies and interest at once. Of course there can be but little actually now said about the seventy-five popular flowers, their friends and cultivators having so often described them and their merits; but that little may be found in this book. Mr. Rand has himself cultivated the plants he writes about, and has found how well they are adapted to our climate, how they may be planted to give the best effects, and how and where they can be most cheaply procured. His favorites are not always our favorites; but the whole list is well selected, and it covers all the herbaceous plants that are actually necessary to make a flower-garden gay from spring to fall. With all their merits, however, they are but a small part of the list he might have described, and probably will describe, at some future time. There are so many persons now who love and cultivate flowers, that a really good book ought to have a wide circle of readers, and we hope Mr. Rand may be rewarded for his pains by a large sale. The title of "Seventy-five Flowers," let us say, is very modest; for, whilst seventy-five species are discussed, so many varieties come under each one that they number several hundred individuals. We can heartily advise all who have a little flower-garden which they want to make glorious at a small cost, to buy this book and learn therein how to do it.

Only a Girl; or, A Physician for the Soul. From the German of Wilhelm von Hillem.—To the merit of producing readable and spirited translations, Mrs. Wister adds that of showing good taste in her selections of originals. Miss Marlitt was a writer whose acquaintance was certainly worth making by American novel readers; and Miss von Hillem, who resembles her somewhat, although she lacks a little of that freshness and spontaneity which made "The Old Ma'mselle's Secret" such pleasant reading, has still made a good story, which may be read with interest as well for the sake of the subjects it discusses as for the manner in which it is told. It is the "Woman Question" which gets Miss von Hillem's attention, and though she treats it in a fresh way, and is clever, and shows a good deal of knowledge, we fear she is not likely to be treated with much reverence or consideration by our Women's Rights agitators, since

her investigations of the subject appear to have led her to conclusions widely diverse from theirs.

Her heroine is a woman who as a child has been left to the guardianship of an uncle—a scientific man of great acquirements, who has been put under the bans by his former professional associates for some malpractice which showed dishonesty. His ward possesses a large property which, in case of her dying unmarried, will fall to her uncle. Not being a vulgar knave—being in fact a most extraordinary sort, we are asked to believe, of rascal—he conceives the idea of killing not her body but her soul; or rather, of wearing out the one by means of the other, and of doing this in a way which shall at the same time earn him the unsuspecting gratitude of his victim. She has a good mind, and he proceeds to train it awry, and at great expense to her physical strength—flattering her meanwhile with the idea that, though only a girl, she has the intellectual strength of a man, and that he will cultivate it to the end that she may help to emancipate her sex, who owe their inferior position merely to the injustice of men, who have systematically kept them in ignorance. In this way he hopes to make her an object of aversion both to her own sex and the other, while he relies on her really noble character and his own constant surveillance to save her from any vulgar errors. He makes her an atheist and an ultra advocate of the rights of women, and when the time comes for her to make her sentiments known, which she does by attacking in well-written essays all forms of religious belief, and by seeking admission to one of the universities, she justifies the wisdom of his calculations by inspiring both men and women with horror. She is nevertheless beautiful and pure-minded, and Miss von Hillem of course rescues her from her entanglements, gives her for a lover one of the manly men one finds in women's novels, and humiliates her pride by countless trials to the point of her owning her love for him and accepting him in marriage, and makes her see by her utter failures and mistakes the sheer folly of her atheism. All this is managed well enough, if once one overlooks the ridiculous improbability of the main conception and is not repelled by the deliberate and gradual bringing about of a foregone conclusion.

. Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books upon the wrapper.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Aguilar (Grace), Days of Bruce, Vols. I., II.	(D. Appleton & Co.) \$2 00
Barker (F., M.D.), On Sea Sickness.	" " " "
Dierrell (B.), Miriam Alroy, swd.	" " " " 0 50
Girdlestone (C.), Christendom	(Sampson Low, Son & Marston)
Kavanagh (Julia), Silvia, swd.	(D. Appleton & Co.) 0 75
Perkins (F. B.), Charles Dickens: his Life and Works.	(G. P. Putnam & Sons)
Ruskin (J.), Lectures on Art.	(John Wiley & Son)
Schouler (J.), Domestic Relations.	(Little, Brown & Co.)

THE PICNIC.

A Delightful Cantata,

WITH

Charming Solos and Brilliant Choruses
of Easy Execution!

BY J. R. THOMAS.

Designed for Schools, Singing Classes, and Social Gatherings. For Mixed Voices, and also for Female Voices, with Sparkling Piano Accompaniments. The most pleasing Cantata for Musical Festivals published.

Price, in boards, \$1. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.

OLIVER DITSON & CO., Boston.

C. H. DITSON & CO., New York.

Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

PUBLISHED DAILY, SUNDAYS EXCEPTED.

No. 607 Chestnut St., Phila.

THE EVENING BULLETIN offers special advantages by its Large Circulation in Business and Family Circles, for all departments of Business Advertising. As the oldest and best Philadelphia evening paper it is the most desirable advertising medium, and is printed on fine paper, large quarto, forty-eight columns, containing the fullest Telegraphic News, Commercial and Financial Reports, Foreign and Domestic Correspondence, Literary and Art intelligence, and all the requisites of a first-class Business and Family Newspaper.

Published by PEACOCK, FETHERSTON & CO.,
607 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.

The Nation Press.

The Proprietors of THE NATION PRESS give notice that they have established a Book, Pamphlet, Job, and Newspaper Printing-Office in this City, and are prepared to execute at moderate prices, for cash, the best of work in any and all of these branches.

For BOOKS they will furnish Electrotype or Stereotype Plates, as desired, and will guaranty unusual accuracy in their preparation.

PAMPHLETS of every description, embracing Prospectuses, Statements, and Reports of Corporations, Statistical, Scientific, and Literary Papers, Law Pleadings, etc., etc., will receive the same attention as books, and be printed with especial care.

JOB WORK, in all its details: Cards, Circulars, Programmes, Bills, Receipts, Forms, etc., will be promptly dispatched, with taste, and in the newest varieties of type.

NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, and other Periodicals will be printed on reasonable terms, and strictly upon time.

In short, the Proprietors undertake to satisfy first-class custom in all that pertains to a general Printing Business.

Orders may be sent to THE NATION PRESS, 27 Rose Street (a few doors North of Frankfort), or to this Office, and estimates will be furnished at either place.

JOHN ROSS, Manager.

CHARLES DICKENS.

TO BE SOLD, a PRESENTATION COPY OF THE CHRISTMAS CAROL, with the following inscription, in Mr. Dickens's handwriting: "W. M. Thackeray. From Charles Dickens (whom he made very happy once a long way from home). Seventeenth December, 1843." This book, which has Mr. Thackeray's book-mark, and was purchased by its present owner for £25 10s. at his sale, forms a touching souvenir of these two great authors.

Address, post-paid, B. G. L., care of Messrs. Street Brothers, Serle Street, Lincoln's-inn, London, where the book may be inspected.

HARTFORD, CONN.,

Daily and Weekly Times

Have widespread circulations throughout the Connecticut Valley, and find ready admission to thousands of families as regularly as the return of the seasons. The Times was established in 1817, and there is not a State in the Union, or hardly a civilized country on the earth, to which copies are not sent.

TERMS: \$2 50 a year, or to Clubs, \$2, for Weekly; \$8 for Daily.

. One of the best mediums for advertisers in New England. Address "Daily Times, Hartford, Conn."

LIFE AND LETTERS OF CAPTAIN JOHN BROWN. Edited by Richard D. Webb, and published by Smith, Elder & Co., London, 1861. In all respects the best life of John Brown ever written. Illustrated by a photographic portrait without a beard, showing perfectly the character of the lower part of the face. Cloth, 12mo, price \$1 50.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price. Address PUBLISHER OF THE "NATION," Box 6732, New York City.

